

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JUNE, 1857.

ART. I.—(1.) *The People's Sunday*. A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Robert Grosvenor, M.P. &c., on his late Sunday Trading Bill. By an Oxford Man. Second Edition. London, Effingham Wilson. 1855.

(2.) *London and the Londoners*. Published by the National Sunday League. 1856.

(3.) *The Sunday Band at Eastbourne*. London, Kenny. 1856.

(4.) *The Sabbath was made for Man*. London, Kenny. 1856.

THE above form a portion of a mass of pamphlets which have appeared during the last two years under the auspices of the National Sunday League. They are directed, as their titles sufficiently indicate, to the defence of the Sunday as a day of national recreation for the people, against the opinion of those who would fetter it by Jewish restrictions. Some of these publications treat the great Sunday question on popular, while others take up the matter on religious grounds. Viewed one with another, their principal value consists in the testimony which they afford to a very deeply-felt, widely-extended, and, on the whole, well-founded dissatisfaction with the present state of law, and public opinion, upon the mode of observing the great weekly holiday given to man for the purposes of religious rest and the recreation necessary to fit him, from time to time, for the duties of a laborious calling.

The great social anomaly which the writers of these various pamphlets deplore, is one to provoke the indignation of every philanthropist, apart altogether from the question of religion. Almighty God, of His great bounty, gives us one day in each week (and, according to the institution of His Church other days also) for His own peculiar service; and in order to remind us that His service is one

of freedom and joy, He has been pleased to connect with it the temporary suspension of all servile and oppressive labour. In this country, however, the beneficent purposes of the all-gracious Creator are in great measure frustrated by the influence of a selfish and narrow-minded superstition. Practically, the English (and of course all that is true of the English is far truer of the Scotch) Sunday is a day neither of rest, recreation, nor religion. The rest of the British Sunday is too often mere idleness; its recreation mere vicious indulgence; its religion a service more burthensome than even the labour it is meant to replace. Whether we take the London or the country Sunday of the British Protestant, the picture we have just given alike admits of forcible illustration. What is the Sunday of the higher circles in the metropolis? A day of indolence and dissipation (at least of mind) to the master and mistress, and to the servant, of work like other days. A late breakfast, a tedious hour and half in the pew or gallery of a fashionable chapel, luncheon, a drive in the parks, a late dinner-party, and perhaps a "*conversazione*," to wind up the day. Such a Sunday is anything but a "*Sabbath*," whether for man-servant, maid-servant, cattle, or the stranger within our gates. The "*Fourth Commandment*," so conscientiously enforced against the poor mechanic and artizan, is ridden over with triumphant scorn by their rich and noble superiors. Pass now to a Sunday in the country. Here, indeed, you have a less open violation of the rule which makes that day a day of rest; but how stands the matter as regards either recreation or religion? Work, indeed, is suspended, but it is in favour of languor and listlessness, and not of anything which can be called *rest*. The piano-forte mute, the innocent game proscribed, conversation at fault, the parents yawning in opposite arm-chairs, an awful silence now and then rudely broken by the fall of the religious volume from the hands of the somnolent reader, or by the entry of the butler with an uninteresting communication from the parsonage; the interminable evening, and the "*Family Prayers*," which at length bring this wearisome day to a welcome end. Such are the accompaniments of that holy and happy festival which is given us wherein to rejoice at the most glorious event in the history of the world; to refresh our jaded spirits, and fit us for earth's work by the periodical anticipation of our heavenly reward!

Yet, unsatisfactory as are these pictures of the aristocratic Sunday, they present even a favourable contrast to the Sunday of the working classes. This is too frequently a day, not merely of frivolity or weariness, but of sinful indulgence. The lateness of the hour at which the religious services of the Establishment begin, absolutely precludes the mechanic and the man of business from any participation in them, however much he might be disposed for it; unless, that is, he be prepared to break in upon his Sunday in a way really not consistent with the necessary demands of health and professional duty. He seizes, (and what wonder?) the earliest moment of the day to exchange the heavy and tainted air of Lambeth or St. Giles's for the refreshing breezes of Hampstead or Richmond; and, once free and at large, gives himself up with the most unrestrained abandonment to the circumstances of the occasion. The one idea which he seeks to carry out, the one standard by which he measures all, is *indulgence*; and, to deprive himself of anything which ministers to this object, seems to him almost like a breach of duty. Work in the week, and jollity on the Sunday; this is pretty much the summary of his moral code. Hence the amount of drinking and debauchery which disgraces the suburban Sabbath of the Londoner forms, by all accounts, a most remarkable contrast to the Sunday of foreign Catholic countries. Moreover, the "day of rest" is converted into a day of enervating and stupifying dissipation; so that on the Monday morning too many will be found to rise from their uneasy couches with their bodily and mental powers less equal to the prospect which awaits them than even at the close of the preceding week. This surely is as great a solecism in political economy as it is a palpable abuse of Christianity.

Whether we look, therefore, to the higher or to the lower classes, the English theory of Sabbath-keeping must be accounted a very grievous blot in our social system. The people of Great Britain, with all their boasted light and freedom, are the victims of a miserable prejudice which, after every allowance for good intentions and unavoidable ignorance on the part of those who encourage it, practically reacts in favour of immorality and irreligion. It totally defeats, moreover, the very objects which its promoters undertake to secure. What aims at preventing the "desecration of the Sabbath" really ends in a profanation

of a far worse kind; and every denunciation which our blessed Redeemer uttered against the abuse of religion among the Scribes and Pharisees of His time, is applicable, to the letter, against the insane and really iniquitous policy we have just described, whereby the door is opened to laxity of every kind by the imposition of unnecessary restraints upon the popular observance of the Lord's day. When, therefore, the authors of the several publications before us contend for the opening of the British Museum and the Picture Galleries, for a free access to the Crystal Palace, and for the allowance of military music in the Parks, as Sunday recreations, not only innocent in themselves, but conducive to the moral improvement of the people, they seem to us to propound truths which it is a reflection upon the common sense of England that we are not able to deal with as admitted truisms, requiring neither proof to establish them nor rhetoric to enforce them. We confess ourselves wholly at a loss to understand what principle deserving of that name, can be secured by a course which drives the popular taste into unhealthy channels by closing up outlets through which it might find its way into others of a far purer and higher kind.

Yet we must candidly acknowledge, as Christians and Catholics, that neither the arguments of the pamphlets before us, nor any others which we are accustomed to meet with in parliamentary speeches or other vehicles of English opinion, appear to us to go to the bottom of the matter to which the question of the popular observance of Sunday belongs. The Sunday question is but part of a great subject in which modern legislation, at least in England, appears to us to be much at a loss, and though we fully admit that sectarian prejudices have set obstacles in its way which would have been fatal to counsels far deeper and far more comprehensive, yet we cannot in justice fasten on those prejudices the whole responsibility for the actual failure of attempts to furnish a great commercial people with suitable modes of relief from the demoralizing pressure of a continual and almost unbroken round of worldly occupation.

If we must speak our whole mind, we should say that the great and essential requisite towards mastering the true idea of popular recreation is a firm grasp of the Catholic religion, which is alone adequate to the satisfaction of this, as of every other want of man, whether in his personal, or in his social capacity. But since this is an im-

pression which we can scarcely hope to communicate with every reader, we must first try and found our conclusions upon a somewhat broader and more popular basis.

The normal idea of recreation is not obscurely intimated in the very etymology of the word itself. Hence it is that we prefer that word to one which is rapidly taking its place—amusement. The advantage of the term, recreation, is that it marks very distinctly the due relation between amusements and the work with which they alternate. To “recreate,” what is it? Surely it is to restore the balance of corporal and mental power which excessive labour has disturbed. It is then God’s appointed method of refitting His own instrument for His own work. Recreation, according to its true object, “makes a new man” of those who duly use it. Let us but carry this idea into the province of our inquiry, and in suggesting the true end of recreation, it will also enable us to define the nature, and prescribe the conditions, of all which is designed to secure that end. It will furnish a standard, tried by which a great deal of what popularly goes by the name of recreation will be found wanting in the great essentials of that noble art, whose province is nothing less than to qualify man by wholesome and suitable diversion of mind for duly answering the end of his existence.

The first condition essential towards all true recreation will accordingly be that it shall at least keep clear of anything which is morally wrong or questionable. Recreation, according to the view just given of it, enters directly into the department of moral duties, and becomes an auxiliary towards carrying out the “end of man.” To admit into it, therefore, anything which militates against that end, or ministers to evil, the great antagonist of that end, would be to contradict its purpose and destroy its essence. Relaxation of mind and body is its *sine qua non* indeed, but the nature of such relaxation must be determined by its object which is the strengthening of the moral as well as the reinvigoration of the physical faculties. Hence, in the next place, recreation, at least of the highest kind, should be more than even negatively harmless; it should be positively (in the ethical sense of the term) *healthy*. By this we do not of course mean that it is to be necessarily religious in its nature, but that it should be generally subservient to the great ends of our being, by putting the entire man into a state of renewed aptitude for his work. Cer-

tainly, when it can be made conducive to any more definitely religious or virtuous impression, without prejudice to its own proper nature, we must account such further effect as a clear gain. But whether this can be so will depend upon our third and last condition of all true recreation, which is, that it should be thoroughly congenial to the character for which it is intended.

The application of these tests to a great deal of the so-called recreation of our time and country would, as we suspect, in different ways convict it of serious, and often fatal deficiencies. The intoxicating draught, the forbidden indulgence, the cruel sport, gambling or betting which keep their victims in a fever of morbid excitement, would vanish at once under the touch of our first criterion. The great moral ends of recreation, it is evident, are flagrantly compromised by whatever clouds the intellect, corrupts the affections, spoils the temper, vitiates the taste, or brutalizes the character. On the other hand, the injudicious attempt to force or precipitate the second proposed object of recreation without a proportionate regard to our third constituent; to give it, that is, a religious or virtuous direction, without consulting the bent of inclination, or providing for the diversities of taste, will explain the signal failure of efforts made by parents or teachers of excellent intentions, but small judgment, to cheat their youthful disciples into the love of religion or virtue by "sanctifying," as the phrase is, their amusements.

We have perhaps said enough to indicate our conviction that, to provide recreation such as we are here supposing; recreation, that is, which shall be pure, yet not dull, relaxing, yet not enervating, invigorating, yet not too exciting, popular, yet not vulgarizing, and much more which the reader will imagine as well as we could describe it, is a problem neither of easy, nor every day solution. And it is evident that the difficulties which embarrass the task of the parent or teacher will be multiplied tenfold where the sphere of invention is not a family, or a school, but a nation. Yet who will deny that the subject is one which justifies and deserves the careful attention of every statesman or legislator who looks to the real and permanent welfare of the people, for whose moral improvement he is, in his measure, responsible? The well-known saying of the ancient philosopher who would have given

up the task of making a nation's laws if he could but have stipulated for the composition of its ballads, was founded in a view of human nature, so deep and true, that all the experience of ages, and all the acquisitions of political science, have been able to add nothing to it. An ounce of good education is worth a pound of law ; and no one has need to be told that of national education (in the fullest sense of the term) Popular Amusements form by no means the least essential ingredient.

It is little more than a truism to say that any well-considered plan of popular recreation must presuppose an intimate knowledge of the national character. Many an enthusiastic traveller has ere now contrasted the elegant pastimes of the French or Italians, with the staid and pompous modes of relaxation prevalent in our own country ; the childlike aptitude for amusement, characteristic of the South, which turns the veriest trifles into occasions of real pleasure, with the churlish and phlegmatic temperament of more northerly latitudes, which treats recreation itself as a business, and mars the enjoyment of God's creatures by carrying a critical and half-supercilious spirit into all it undertakes. But national character refuses to be changed by any such violent processes ; and we may as well expect to find the fruit of the orchard upon the brambles of the wilderness as try to engraft exotic recreational tastes, (at least abruptly) upon native tempers. Greenwich and St. Cloud must continue to preserve their characteristic features, so distinctive of the several peoples ; Englishmen will rejoice in cricket, and Italians love their *tombola*, however we may desire to force upon the one nation more light-heartedness, and upon the other more gravity.

At the same time we are far from desiring to treat national character as that hard and unelastic material which it is sometimes represented. Many facts concur in leading us to think that it admits, if not of radical change, yet at least of material modifications. And this is a point so important towards our present subject, that we shall readily be excused for giving it a brief consideration, and dwelling for a moment upon the phenomena which bear upon the question.

We choose our own country as the most interesting and appropriate field of inquiry, and find, even within the range of our actual and of course very limited experience, much to indicate that our national character is far from being

stereotyped into any unalterable form. Indeed, when we consider the many conditions upon which such character depends, and that some of these conditions are in their very nature of a shifting and capricious kind, we shall find an abundant explanation of those changes in the public taste which often present themselves even to superficial observers during the course of a single generation. Take, for example, the mere fact of an increased intercourse with the continent of Europe, especially as facilitated by modern improvements in travelling. Those who are able to compare the England of thirty years ago with the England of the present day, can trace perceptible differences in the popular taste, some of which have evidently resulted from the opening of the continent by the Peace of 1814. Whether, in more essential points, our national character have been improved by the effects of an habitual intercourse with foreign countries, is a matter not directly to our present subject. That it has been modified, however, there can be no doubt. It is impossible to meet English on the Continent, in these days, without seeing at once that the wall of national prejudice which, some years ago, formed a barrier to all mutual influences for good is lowered, and in process apparently of being broken down altogether, unless, unhappily, anything should arise to disturb our friendly relations with the Continent. Indeed, the fears of some persons run in an opposite direction, and there are not wanting evidences of an "Anglo-mania" on the one side, and a "Gallo-mania" on the other, which, in their extreme forms, are unnatural and undesirable. Here, however, we speak of these things merely in their bearing upon our present subject, and undoubtedly our national *taste* has undergone changes which indicate a change even in the national mind. We are outgrowing our predilection for *vulgar* amusements; some may even think, to the injury of our characteristic manliness. The opening of the Crystal Palace has been followed, at no long interval, by the decline of Greenwich Fair. The unctuous poles, the pigs with soapy tails, the sacks, and the horse-collars, are rapidly yielding, as objects of popular interest, to the refined attractions, internal and external, of the great Sydenham wonder.

A change of the public taste in the higher direction, which is conspicuously evident, is the greatly-increased

popularity of *music* as a means of recreation. This, indeed, is a striking phenomenon in favour of the impressibility of national character. No taste can be less artificial than is the sympathy to which music addresses itself; and besides being less easily acquired, it is also less easily pretended than other tastes, such, for instance, as that for works of art. People, it may be observed, are generally less inclined to avow the want of a taste for pictures, than the absence of the musical faculty. This is because love of the fine arts is felt to be an accomplishment, love of music a *gift*. Besides, music, to those who do not like it, is a simple annoyance; thus a person who has no natural fondness for it, is compelled to make the confession of his deficiency in self-defence. It is otherwise with works of art. They present different grounds of attraction to different tastes. There is such a thing as liking them more or less; but music is, for the most part, either an intense pleasure, or an intolerable nuisance. Hence the steps, or rather strides, which the love of music has made in this country, during the last twenty or thirty years, are real evidence even of a considerable modification in the national character. The supply indicates a demand, and the demand proves a *bona fide* appetite and appreciation.

In one respect it proves even more. This increased taste points quite as much in the direction of sacred, as of secular, music. Handel's *Messiah*, and Mendelssohn's *Elijah*, are never offered to the public in an attractive form without receiving the response of positively overflowing audiences. This is a fact from which we are disposed to infer, that public taste, even in this country, is no such stubborn thing as it is often thought, but that it admits of being moulded, to a certain extent, by circumstances, and even at will. It does not precede and direct the amusements supplied to it so simply and so decidedly as not to be itself also, coincidentally, the result of the very satisfactions supplied to it. Its appetite for gratification increases with the very food on which it thrives; so that, it would be hard to discriminate which is cause, and which effect. This is peculiarly the case with the love of music. That taste which, of all others is pronounced to be the most natural and capricious, seems in a very remarkable way to be growing into the English mind. It is commonly, and so far as our observation extends, truly, remarked that the rising generation of

England are far more musically disposed than their predecessors. People of three score years old say that there is a marked difference in this respect, between the children of the present and those of the former age. The boys in the streets are now constantly heard whistling or humming the popular airs of operas, with an accuracy and taste which evidently prove that "ears" are on the rise. The demand for music, and its supply, are certainly growing up together. Now, when it is considered how very useful and serviceable an auxiliary in popular recreation music is, this fact is not without its interest as a stimulant to the hopes of those who look forward to a great reform in that department of our social administration.

The fact is interesting in another point of view. Are there not influences yet more salutary than those of music itself, which might possibly find their way back to the minds and hearts of the English people, since we learn from this instance, that "tastes" are not necessarily extinct because they are dormant, or uncreatable because non-existent? Nay, are there not indications of no obscure kind, that these more important influences, when they are forthcoming, even in a most imperfect form, are met by a response, nay, perhaps even anticipated by an instinct, and aided by a sympathy? If in this connection we mention the name of the Rev. Mr. Spurgeon, and thus seem to imply that the spiritual food supplied by that very distinguished preacher to the public appetite, is of the nature of a "Popular Recreation," we can assure him very sincerely that we mean no disrespect, as indeed the sequel of our observations will prove. We know nothing of Mr. Spurgeon, and have never been present at any of his public addresses; and we desire to take no side in the conflicting criticisms of which he is the object. But, be his errors in doctrine, or his defects in taste, what they may, (and we are not the persons to underrate either,) his extraordinary success as a candidate for public favour, is at any rate a *phenomenon* which theorists upon the subject of popular recreation certainly ought not to disregard. What is the explanation of Mr. Spurgeon's popularity? At any rate it is a most surprising fact, and really worth a little speculation in any attempt to fathom the æsthetical character and tendencies of the present English people. Here is the drama developing itself into every conceivable shape, in order to meet every known variety of the public taste; tragedy,

comedy, farce, pantomime, melodrame, all expanding their treasures of popular interest in the most unbounded profusion; music of every style, and every grade of excellence, laying herself out in a hundred places every night to captivate the knowing or subdue the million; the Crystal Palace, with its matchless charms of natural beauty and artistic embellishment; the Polytechnic, the Panoramas, the Zoological, Madame Tussaud, Albert Smith, all vying with each other; some striving to popularize science, others to dramatize history, others to supersede travelling, by epitomizing its results, and concentrating its discoveries; and yet "the" attraction of the day is neither the drama, nor the concert, nor the picture gallery, nor the crystal palace, nor even Mont Blanc, (great as is the popularity of all,) but a young preacher, of anything (unless his photograph much misrepresents him,) but engaging appearance, who, without the adjuncts of ceremonial, music, or even any of the customary appendages of his position, contrives time after time to fill, by his unaided powers, the largest buildings in the metropolis with audiences compared with which the ordinary concourses of the theatre, or the concert room, shrink into comparative insignificance!

Now, after making every reasonable allowance for such explanation of this phenomenon as strip it of any great religious interest, we must still feel that it indicates on the part of the English people a yearning which admits of being turned to some good account. It may be said, indeed, that the extensive following of Mr. Spurgeon is a mere fashion or *furor* of the day, like that which night after night fills a theatre during the performance of some favourite *prima donna*, or accomplished actor. But this account would not explain how the "rage" was first created, or how it has come to select a preacher of no extraordinary education as the object of its enthusiasm. Or it may be said (with a good deal more truth,) that Sunday recreations are prized in proportion to their scarcity, and it is hinted that Mr. Spurgeon might easily thin his congregation by putting on a charge of sixpence or a shilling a head upon his admirers. But we are informed, on the contrary, by persons in the secret, that he finds an enormous demand even for five shilling tickets. After allowing, then, all which can reasonably be asked on the score of fashion, cheapness, want of competition, and the personal charms of the preacher, we adhere to the opinion

that the fact is remarkable, of the greatest popular attraction of the day being an exhibition of a religious, or quasi-religious character.

The conclusion we wish to draw from the appearances of the time, (including especially Mr. Spurgeon's extraordinary popularity,) is, that either the English taste is on the change, or that the English popular character has a certain vein of sympathy underlying its surface, which has not yet been thoroughly explored. Facts in short lead us to believe that the English people are impressible by certain influences of the highest order in the department of moral education, and of absolutely indefinite value in their bearing upon its future destinies—music and religion.

The attentive observation of such facts, which, like the straws, indicating the quarter from which the wind blows, have results most disproportionate to their intrinsic importance, is absolutely necessary towards forming a judgment upon theories of popular recreation. Too much stress, is apt to be laid in this, as in far more important subjects, upon the supposed inflexible attributes of our national character. Englishmen are popularly thought to be created upon a certain type, which, instead of itself being open to impression from circumstance, is taken as the standard according to which they are to be dealt with in all that concerns their moral and spiritual improvement. What is more common than to hear it said, "Such and such things may do very well abroad, but they will not go down in England." For instance: "Englishmen are essentially untheological. They take broad and unsystematic views of religious questions; they dislike above all things, technicality and hair-splitting." Or again, "Englishmen are naturally opposed to mystery, they are a straightforward, common-sense people. They detest Irish or Italian superstitions. If you desire to make them read the *Lives of the Saints*, for instance, you must 'cook,' you must 'doctor' the foreign article. What these biographies contain may be, and no doubt is, all very true, but it is unsuited to a matter-of-fact people like the English." The same principle is applied to questions of architecture, ceremonial, and other subjects less vitally affecting the true interests of a Christian people.

In our humble judgment all this reasoning, besides being (in some cases at least,) highly mischievous, proceeds upon a complete mistake. That man, certainly,

would be a very short-sighted legislator, whether for the material or the spiritual interests of a people who, in dealing with them, should overlook differences of national character which will continue to exist after all the modifications of circumstance. But, to suppose that Englishmen are created after one pattern, or that our national character is not open to almost indefinite changes, and constantly undergoing them, is certainly to put theory in the place of facts and experience. The national character is liable to change, because it has actually changed. What change can be greater than that from Catholic to Protestant? There was a time when England yielded to none of the nations of the Continent in the susceptibility of innocent and healthy pleasure; "merrie" was her customary epithet *par excellence*. We have lying before us at this moment the history of the Shows and Pageants, and "Miracle Plays" to which England was once singularly addicted, and of which the ghosts are yet, or were recently to be seen, at Shrewsbury, Lichfield, Coventry, and we doubt not many other of our provincial towns with which we happen to be less acquainted. These popular exhibitions are described as having been frequented by multitudes of every rank, from the king and queen down to the humblest of their subjects. They contained, it is true, many coarse features utterly inconsistent with the ideas of the present age. Yet it may well be doubted whether our advancement in real delicacy of moral feeling has been in proportion to our progress in civilization and social refinement. Old chroniclers speak of the morals of those ancient times in language which no candid historian could apply to the present generation; and nothing can be more unfair than to estimate the character and effect of popular representations of a former time by the standard of the more fastidious, yet not therefore necessarily higher, morality of later ages.

But the point of our argument upon which these records bear is that of the shifting phenomena of our national character. If the popular judgment of the present national mind be correct, the change which it has undergone in the course of centuries is assuredly nothing short of a revolution. The extraordinary attractiveness of the ancient modes of popular recreation indicates, beyond all question, a phase of character the most opposite which is even conceivable to that which is commonly attributed to the Eng-

land of the present day. For the very last description which an historian would give of our national taste in the nineteenth century, is that it betokens the susceptibility of simple amusement, and the love of the marvellous, which belong to children; and yet this is pre-eminently the account which meets the facts of the præ-Reformation era. Some well-known incident of the Holy Scriptures, such as the Sacrifice of Isaac, the Finding of Moses, or one of the "Joyful Mysteries" of the New Testament, would then draw multitudes to a provincial town from all parts of the island, and prove an attraction even to royalty itself.

We anticipate the reply. It will be said that the whole difference turns upon the question of civilization; that the love of the marvellous, and the childlike susceptibility of simple pleasure, which were characteristic of mediæval England, have taken their flight for ever from our shores, and are now found only in the benighted and semi-barbarous regions of earth. But this is a point which, as Catholics, we cannot concede in theory, and which, as men of the world, we do not recognize in fact. In the first place, to call the Romans, or Neapolitans of the present day (among whom these tastes actually and extensively prevail,) *uncivilized* peoples, is simply absurd, at a moment when England itself is coveting their taste, and emulating their success, in the Fine Arts. This consideration alone shifts the question from the ground of mental cultivation to that of national character. And here is where we are disposed to question the conclusion which supposes the English mind so fixed and wooden, as to be unimpressible by extrinsic influences. What a most remarkable fact, for instance, is the hold which the spirit of St. Philip Neri has taken upon this same English mind! What is the one Catholic institution in London which disputes even with the most successful forms of Protestant attraction, the sway of the popular affections? Beyond all question it is the Oratory, whether as manifested in its centre, at Brompton, or as diffused in its spirit elsewhere. We are not here entering into the question of controversy, but merely stating a matter of undeniable fact. At the London Oratory, all which the English are theoretically supposed to prefer is subordinated to what they are represented as disliking, even to abhorrence. The bias of all, whether architecture, ceremonial, or the spirit of which these are but the outward form, is characteristically and unmistakeably Roman; nay, an objector

would say (though we do not adopt the word,) *Italian*. The religion of *awe*, (of which Gothic forms are the most exact and magnificent expression,) is there replaced by the religion of joy and love; "enthusiasm" rather than "solemnity," (according to the usual idea of that term,) would be the word used to denote the spirit of the religious worship; while the "supernatural," which is sometimes treated as England's abomination, is habitually either assumed as the basis of teaching, or symbolized in the visible exhibition of the religious idea. The whole thing is pronounced by the captious Protestant, or the pompous Anglican, to be "childish," "methodistical," "profane," "lax," and as the climax and epitome of all, entirely "un-English." But if they will not accept our hypothesis, that there are laws of influence more powerful even than national character, they must be requested to furnish some solution of the problem, which will harmonize these undoubted facts with their own theory. For ourselves we must confess that such facts completely baffle us, and we are rather throwing them out for consideration than citing them in support of any fixed view of our own. We really have no fixed view. We see, on the one hand, that there is such a thing as a distinct national character, and that it survives all circumstantial changes. Yet the phenomena we have just described almost lead us to rub our eyes, as if either those phenomena or the conclusions they contradict, must be a dream. Can it be that Rome has the wand of a magician, or rather the rod of a prophet, which is destined to transform and unify, even national natures? This is a "view," at all events, however, conjectural.

What, then, is the case? Is it that the English taste is wholly revolutionized, or is it not rather that there are elements in that taste which are as yet but imperfectly understood? We are inclined to the latter of these opinions. We have already given some reasons for thinking that there are deeper sympathies in the English mind and heart than are dreamed of in the philosophy of modern statesmen, and especially that there are latent instincts which point as to satisfactions of a higher order, so among the rest to a more elevating character of popular recreation. Why, for instance, should not the almost boundless resources of the drama be turned to a more profitable account? The success of our religious oratorios is surely a fact which

might be profitably used. We never attend the performance of Mendelssohn's *Elijah* without feeling its wonderful capacities of dramatic effect. Even as it stands, it is a far more edifying performance than many a Protestant sermon. What then would it not be with the addition of scenic accompaniments? Imagine the effect of the chorus of the Priests of Baal if sung in character, with the appropriate dresses and situations! You would have an altar in the background, with the Prophet by its side in the suitable costume. Ranging from him to the front of the stage, on one side, would be the priests and people of God, and opposite, the priests and adherents of the idol worship. The prophet would call upon the impious crew, in the magnificent words of taunting irony which the Scriptures attribute to him, and which the great composer has invested with the most expressive music. The priests would respond in chorus, and call louder and louder upon their unheeding god, as the prophet from time to time reiterated his provoking appeal. At length the fire would descend from heaven upon the ready sacrifice of God's people, and the barbaric howl of the baffled priests would give way to the jubilant thanksgiving chorus of the favoured suppliants. What Christian child that witnessed such a representation as this could ever forget that portion of its Bible history? By such exhibitions even Protestants themselves might be won over to the principle of the sacred drama, and the most touching and instructive passages in ecclesiastical history, to say nothing of some of the less mysterious portions of the New Testament, (such, for instance, as the subject of Mendelssohn's *St. Paul*,) might be worked into the popular mind by the salutary beguilements of a most innocent and beautiful recreation,

— deceptaque non capiatur,
Sed potius tali tactu recreata valescat.*

As it stands, the theatre is a difficulty in the way of those who desire to make popular recreations a vehicle of moral improvement. We are far from being on the side

* We cannot but notice in this connexion the Provost of Northampton's very beautiful and skilful dramatic adaptation of Dr. Newman's tale of *Callista*. A similar adaptation of *Fabiola* was reviewed in our July Number last year.

of those who would rigorously exclude it, even as it is, from the number of innocent amusements. We can see nothing about it which brings it under the proscribed category of *necessary* "occasions of sin;" on the contrary, we have good reason for believing that, in particular cases, of no very rare occurrence, it may even be an occasion of virtue. The tendency of the actual stage is in the direction of improvement as far as relates to the description of the pieces represented. The personal character of many of our more popular actresses, and even actors, has been above the average of correctness; and as to the immoral accidents of our theatres, they form part of a system of legislative connivance at vice against which it is hopeless to protest, and which is unhappily too universal to be cured (as regards the mass of the population) by the mere proscription of one particular class of dangerous opportunities. Yet no person can truly say that the question of the Christian legality of play-going in England is free from its difficulties, while every moralist, we suppose, would admit it to be matter of just regret that the art which has produced such treasures, both of intellectual power and moral instructiveness, as *Athalie* or *Macbeth*, should have so far fallen from its high rank among instruments of popular recreation as to be pronounced only less than an undeniable evil.

If among various means of enlightened popular amusement we have hitherto said but little of pictures, it is not that we undervalue their importance in refining taste, elevating sentiment, and even teaching morality and religion. No one indeed would think of contending that the substitution of a more elegant and refined, for a coarser and more homely order of amusements is *necessarily* an introduction of a more, in place of a less, moral standard of taste and principle. The true remedy against the abuse of all which ministers to recreative pleasure lies deeper than in the character and circumstances of such pleasure, which does not of course lose its possible dangers by changing its external form. The picture, and still more the statue, gallery have their temptations for one class of minds, as the race-course, or the fair, or the theatre, for others. But we should cordially hail the time when our natural taste should be so far improved as to find its satisfaction in the beautiful and ennobling productions of continental art; more especially if presented to the English eye with a con-

scientious, no less than an erudite and discriminative, judgment upon the merits of the works selected. It is a most happy coincidence that in painting (unlike statuary) religious and artistic excellences are united in nearly all the greatest master-pieces. The most perfect specimens of the pictorial art are those which the illustration of the Christian religion, in some of its chief persons, or incidents, is the object; and it is difficult to estimate the moral, as well as æsthetical, advantages which might result from familiarising the mind of the English public with subjects of this kind, appealing at once to their religious sympathies and to their love of the beautiful. The name of HERBERT alone is enough to suggest what can be effected in this way by genius devoted to its highest, but only adequate end. Yet on the whole, the day appears to be distant at which the pictorial art, in its most perfect application, is likely to produce any great impression upon our countrymen. There is, as far as we can observe, a want of popular interest in this matter which looks ill for the speedy advance of the taste; while, to speak plainly, there is an apparent absence of depth, experience, and union, in the counsels to the issue of which the proposed experiment of a National Gallery is committed, which intimate that the man is yet to arise who shall elevate the national character, and direct the national taste, in this particular department of Popular Recreation.* Upon our theory of demand and supply, acting and reacting upon each other in matters of public taste, it is not difficult to account for the little progress which the love of the beautiful in painting has hitherto made amongst us, especially when compared with the kindred subject of Music.

It is thus, that, to whichever quarter of the social horizon

* We hope that the Lectures recently delivered by Cardinal Wiseman at the Marylebone Institution, on the formation of a National Gallery, are destined to meet the public eye in a printed form. We had ourselves the pleasure of hearing the first of them; and we can only say of it, that it appeared to betoken an amount of knowledge on the subject which would alone lead one to suppose that the eminent Lecturer had never made any thing but the Fine Arts his proper study. We came to a conclusion which we suspect was pretty extensively shared by our fellow-auditors of the Lecture, and which we thus embody in words: Why is not Cardinal Wiseman on the National Committee of Taste?

we turn, we meet with the most impressive testimonies to the loss which England has sustained in giving up the Catholic religion as a national institution. The Catholic Church is, in truth, the one solution of every problem of the day, the one specific against all our dominant evils. Practical legislation is paralysed for want of it. England's harp, which might yield so sweet a strain, is mute because there is no *Æolian* breath to elicit its divine harmonies. Legislation is stagnant, and legislators fold their hands in baffled indolence, or waste their words in the discussion of interminable questions, or the handling of absolutely insoluble problems, because they will not be directed, we say not by the dictates of authority, but by the lessons of all past experience. And the same cause which leaves the poor without compassion, the young without training, public morality without enlightened guidance, domestic happiness without its appointed safeguards; consigning the highest interests of the nation, both temporal and eternal, to the random influences of a mere tentative, not to say empirical policy, instead of subjecting them to the time-approved conclusions of a sound political science; this same cause, the ungrateful rejection of the Church of God, presents the real obstacle to all attempts in the direction of improving the character of our national recreations.

It is the Catholic religion which would secure all the constituents of such popular diversions as we have been attempting to describe. Catholicity would first form and then favour according to its very first principle, the bent of the national humour, and even condescend to it in every way and degree short of sinful compliances. At that point it would pause, and address itself to the regulation, with a gentle and affectionate hand, of those amusements which the needs of a people demanded, or the current of their feelings might invite. Above all, it would break down that fatal barrier which Protestantism has raised between the spiritual and the secular, whereby all that is dull, gloomy and prosaic, is relegated to the side of religion; all that is cheerful and fascinating left to the clear possession of the world. This separation it is which lies at the root of all the irreligion of the day. What wonder that the people (and a right noble-hearted people it is) should escape, the first moment that their "Sabbath" brings its welcome relief, from the almost intolerable burden of the religious Sunday in England or Scotland, and rush headlong into

dissipation, worldly if not sinful, as the appropriated mode of keeping it? Upon what view of human nature can you, or ought you, to expect that the man of business who has been up to his ears in parchments and accounts during the week, will stay in town to endure the scarcely bearable burden of a religious service, composed of rhetorical addresses to the Almighty, heartless psalm-singing, and, perhaps, a controversial sermon? And to say the truth, this is the great reason why we feel ourselves unable to throw ourselves heart and soul into the anti-Sabbatarian movement. A Sabbath of superstitious restraint is undoubtedly an evil, and a great one; but a Sabbath of mere dissipation is another; and between these alternatives there is absolutely no middle passage except a Catholic Sunday. The Catholic who goes to his "duties" on the Saturday night, and hears mass early on the Sunday morning has not only fulfilled the first and great obligation of the day, but is fortified against the dangers of its appropriate recreations to an extent which admits of his entering into them, not only with greater security against danger, but with a far better chance of real enjoyment.

Moreover, the due observance of the various Holy Days prescribed by the Church would tend, not only to break in more effectually upon the power of the world, but would be the best corrective of the Sabbatical prejudice, by assimilating the observance of the different days through which the Church has distributed that religious rest and consecration of our time to God, for the principle of which, (as distinct from its practical modifications,) the Decalogue is her warrant. But upon this subject we forbear to do more than refer the reader to the pages of the *Dublin Review* at a former period of its history.*

But the greatest, perhaps, of all the services which the Catholic Church renders to the people among whom it prevails, is in clearing their ideas of the due relation between their religious and social duties. The element of love, divine and human, is that which it introduces into every practical subject; this is the warm tint which invests every object in its cheering and attractive glow. The Catholic goes to his church and feels that he is not turning

* "On National Holy Days," *Dublin Review*, for May 1843, reprinted in Cardinal Wiseman's *Essays*, vol. 1.

his back upon the fair things of creation, but only entering upon the use of them under a new aspect and in a different relation; in their bearing, that is, upon their great Author. He carries this impression back into the world, and sees all with another pair of eyes; or rather, (to revert to our illustration,) through a tinted glass. This surely is the idea of Christian *regeneration* in its fullest sense; the renewal of the inner man, and the renewal of the outer world. What God has joined, heresy has severed; hence the only idea which serious-minded heretics have of the external world is that of a great dreary district, not only unconsecrated, but banned; or at least if they attempt to "sanctify" it, as they say, it is by introducing the only quality which they associate with religion—servile fear. How remarkably is this truth exemplified in the Sabbath controversy! While one party is for robbing God's day of every cheerful attribute; the other is for converting it into a day of simple worldliness. One would think that the Protestant Scriptures were wanting in the text "*Gaudete in Domino.*"

When our Catholic readers kindly bear in mind that we are writing in the "*Month of Mary,*" they will be the less surprised at the vein in which our thoughts are running. It was our privilege a few days back to witness a sight which vividly illustrated the union we are describing, of the religious with the beautiful. There was nothing elaborate, scarcely anything premeditated about it; no studied publicity, no ceremonial pomp, no fuss, no costliness. But all this makes it only the more plain how natural the union of the elements in question is felt by those who take things as they come, and do not measure them by "*views*" or "*theories.*" There is a Catholic church in the outskirts of the metropolis to which is attached rather a spacious plot of ground formerly used as a cemetery, sufficient to admit the deploying of a large procession. On the occasion to which we allude, the Catholic school-children of the parish, to the number of four hundred, having been first catechised in the doctrines and duties of their religion, were marshalled in processional order and proceeded round the church and subsequently the open enclosure, headed by the clergy and numerous youthful assistants in ecclesiastical dress, the Images of our Blessed Lady being borne by the members of the Confraternity devoted to her. A portion of the children were attired in white, others in

gay fancy costumes ; a number of banners with the insignia of Our Lady floated in the gentle breeze of the lovely May weather ; some children carried the crucifix and other emblems of our Lord's Passion, others strewed flowers ; and in this fashion (numbering with the ecclesiastics and followers nearly seven hundred persons) they made the circuit of the enclosure, entirely filling it and chanting the praises of God's Mother and their own, at the full stretch of their shrill voices. The ground is surrounded by houses, the windows of which were entirely filled with Protestants, many of whom brought their children "to see the pretty sight." The very numbers in the procession were alone sufficient to command respect, independently of the evident reality of the whole thing. Vice and irreligion themselves must have been shamed into silence, if not converted into sympathy, by the sight of such a number of innocent faces warmed into a glow of festive joy, such as art could not give, nor hypocrisy feign. Will those Protestant children with whose earliest impressions this scene will be connected, soon, or easily forget it ? Will it not survive the inroads of time, neutralize the arguments of controversy, perhaps even counteract the fascinations of sin ? Will they be satisfied to be told that all these little ones were the slaves of priestcraft and the victims of superstition, all this manifestation of evidently serious, yet purely religious joy, a mockery and an offence to God ? We opine not.

Here, then, is a specimen of Christian "Popular Recreation," of the purely ecclesiastical kind. In this example religion is the predominating element. Yet even when it does not predominate, it might still elevate and purify. The description we have just given proves how far from true is the popular idea, that to sanctify joy is to lessen it, or that to gladden religion is to weaken its practical effect. Now of all ways in which the Catholic religion prevails to secure this great object of wedding, in an eternal union, the beautiful with the pure, and the joyous with the ascetical, the prominence given to the honour of the Blessed Virgin is perhaps the most obvious and effectual. Divested of the idea of the Blessed Mother of God, or in so far as this idea is depressed, and hampered by controversial limitations, Christianity is sure to wear a gloomy and repulsive aspect. But viewed through the medium of MARY all is lit up with the sunny glow of divine love. In

her every instinct of human affection is satisfied, every imagination of created beauty much more than realized. Mary is the "*speculum justitiæ*," in whom the beauty of the Divine perfections is reflected upon a tangible surface; the "*causa nostræ lætitiæ*," as she was the chosen instrument of approximating God to man, and man to God, and as she is the embodiment and acme in a simply created form of every amiable quality of which a mere creature, albeit of faultless mould, is actually susceptible. When England recovers the idea of the Blessed Virgin, then, (and not till then), will it be the holy and joyous nation of the olden and golden time. When her people once more feed upon the idea of the Mother of God, so radiant with joy, so awful in sanctity, then, and not till then, will they be able to taste earth's pleasures without contracting earth's pollution. Sin and sorrow will remain, but the power of the one will be subdued, and the sting of the other unbarbed, when England's children shall be taught to invoke, with the first accents of infantine affection, that heavenly Mother who is at once the "refuge of sinners," the "comforter of the afflicted," and the "help of all Christians." Then will be fulfilled, (so far as the necessary drawbacks of this world will allow), the Psalmist's beautiful picture of a truly prosperous nation. "*Quorum filii sicut novelle plantationis in juventute suâ; filiæ eorum compositæ, circumornatæ ut similitudo templi. Promptuaria eorum plena, eructantia ex hoc in illud. Oves eorum fœtosæ, abundantes in egressibus suis; boves eorum crassæ; non est ruina maceriæ, neque transitus, neque clamor in plateis eorum. Beatum dixerunt populum, cui hæc sunt; beatus populus, cujus Dominus, Deus est.*"*

* Ps. cxliii, 12-15.

ART. II.—*The Spanish Conquest in America, and its relations to the History of Slavery and the Government of Colonies.* By Arthur Helps. 3 vols. 8vo. London: Parker and Son, 1857.

“**WHOEVER,**” says Mr. Macaulay, “wishes to be well acquainted with the morbid anatomy of governments, whoever wishes to know how great states may be made feeble and wretched, should study the history of Spain. The empire of Philip the Second was undoubtedly one of the most powerful and splendid that ever existed in the world. In Europe he ruled Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands on both sides of the Rhine, Franche Comté, Rousillon, the Milanese, and the two Sicilies. Tuscany, Parma, and the other small states of Italy, were as completely dependent on him as the Nizam and Rajah of Berar now are on the East India Company. In Asia the king of Spain was master of the Philippines, and of all those rich settlements which the Portuguese had made on the coasts of Malabar and Coromandel, in the Peninsula of Malacca, and in the Spice Islands of the eastern archipelago. In America his dominions extended on each side of the equator into the temperate zone. There is reason to believe that his annual revenue amounted, in the season of his greatest power, to a sum near ten times as large as that which England yielded to Elizabeth. He had a standing army of fifty thousand excellent troops at a time when England had not a single battalion in constant pay. His ordinary naval force consisted of a hundred and forty galleys. He held what no other prince in modern times has held, the dominion both of the land and of the sea. During the greater part of his reign he was supreme on both elements. His soldiers marched up to the capital of France, his ships menaced the shores of England.” Such was the Spain of Philip the Second, and we forbear in pity to describe the Spain of Isabella the Second. Suffice it to say, that in power, in dignity, in prosperity, in influence, she is of little more account than Hanover or Wirtemberg. We do not think that the decline of Spain is ascribable to any peculiar vice in the constitution of her ancient government, or that the Spanish monarchy, at one time certainly the greatest in the world, had within it

more active elements of dissolution than any other European power. It was indeed watched with the utmost jealousy and assailed with the most persevering enmity first by France, and afterwards by France and England together. Its dismemberment was a fixed resolve in the councils of both of these kingdoms, and Naples and the Low Countries were severed from the monarchy in consequence of that resolution. The Spanish empire in Europe was so great as to alarm the fears and attract the enmity of every strong and independent power, while it never possessed a man of sufficient genius to give character, and consistency, and unity to so many provinces. Charles the Fifth assuredly was not the man to do so, and his miserable policy in dealing with the Reformation was one of the not very remote causes of the downfall of Spain. When he indulged the reformers in disputations and conferences, and played fast and loose with sedition, spiritual and civil, in every state in Germany, he did so from no love or even with any conception of toleration. The idea of toleration was as little known to any religious party of the time as was that of the steam-engine, or the electric telegraph. All his "decrees ad interim," all his shuffling and temporising were the result of a policy hesitating, small, crooked, and selfish. He never faltered in his allegiance to Catholicity; at no period of his life was he one degree more friendly to the Reformation than when, on his death-bed, he commended the inquisition to the especial protection of his son. But he thought he might allow the fire to burn for his private purposes within a charmed circle, and quench it when he thought proper. Everyone is now agreed it was owing to him solely that the Reformation at length reached his own provinces; and it is equally certain that had it been suppressed, as it might have been, in Germany, it never could have travelled to England, and converted the old ally of Spain into her most relentless enemy—an enemy that, within the last fifty years, after a temporary alliance for her private purposes, did for the same purposes in the hour of peace and repose, steal behind and hamstring her unsuspecting ally. "I shall convulse the new world," said the English minister, "in order to restore the balance of the old;" he did so, and in the course of a few months Spain had lost her entire empire upon the American continent; and that empire itself was shattered into fragments, each battling with the other, and

each divided against itself, the most distressing spectacle of bloodshed and misrule that the world presents.

Another cause, however, was concerned in the downfall of Spain. That very American Empire, which of itself ought to have made Spain the greatest nation in the world, was in many ways the cause of her decline. To one of those causes the History before us more particularly points. It professes to deal with the Spanish Conquest of America, considered in connection with the institution of Slavery, that institution which, after having contributed so much to the ruin of the Spanish power, is probably destined to work the ruin of a power much more formidable, more threatening, and more aggressive than was Spain at any period of her history. It will be necessary always to keep this consideration in view while reading Mr. Helps' book, as it has been written to aid the discussion of the question of modern or commercial slavery. The introductory pages comprise a full and curious abstract of the Portuguese discoveries along the coast of Africa, which include the earliest period of Negro Slavery. The history proper begins of course with the expedition of Columbus, and soon takes up the piteous story of the Indian population, the blind and relentless tyranny of the Spanish Colonists, and the efforts and sacrifices of Las Casas and his fellow labourers, for the redemption and protection of the sufferers. It is evident from Mr. Helps' pages, if other evidence there were none, that the zeal of Las Casas was no momentary spirit of benevolence—no isolated piece of Howardism, or Chisolmism, or Ashleyism. It was part of a system, it belonged to the traditional policy of the Church, as is acknowledged by all historians, freely by some and grudgingly by others. It was the same spirit which dictated and compelled the emancipation of the villeins in England, that with less success, but under circumstances widely different, attempted the deliverance of the Indian people from their bondage. Las Casas, invariably successful in Spain, and supported to its utmost strength by Rome, was nevertheless unable to carry out his views at such a distance from the central government, amongst men of the class to which the Spanish adventurers belonged. In nothing, as it seems to us, is this history more successful than in vindicating the Spanish government from much of the responsibility that might seem at first sight to attach to it. Never was court more open to

conviction, or more ready to decree reform, but never was court so badly served. Las Casas well knew, as Mr. Helps in one place remarks, that the servants of the Crown would place the royal order upon their heads with every mark of oriental respect, and then dismiss it from their minds for good. But no disaster, no discomfiture, no miscarriage in the very hour of success,—no disappointment however unlooked for, was sufficient to damp the energy of Las Casas, or to dry up his fertility in expedients. His connexion with the question of slavery brings him and his companions much more frequently before the reader in these volumes than in those of Robertson, or perhaps in any modern history of the period. In fact, throughout a large portion of the work he is the prominent, the commanding figure, and his labours form the substance of much of the entire history. Indeed, the narrative of Las Casas is, in most instances, the authority upon which Mr. Helps relies for many of the principal facts, and they are frequently given in his very words. This alone is an element of additional value in the work. It brings you into intimate acquaintance with the best and greatest man in the history of Spanish America, where so much is good and great, as well as wicked and mean, while it is also a guarantee for the authenticity of the book, and the right feeling and judgment of the author, upon matters which so much require the exercise of both these qualities.

Mr. Helps, it is apparent, deals with the subject in a spirit of perfect fairness, and it would be altogether too much to expect him to be free from prepossessions of any kind. No man can quite divest himself of these, or be always upon his guard against them. In the present instance, according to our view, where they do exist, they only serve to recommend the general candour of the writer. Indeed, it hardly seems possible for a man of good understanding and honest purpose, to acquire a complete knowledge of the materials out of which Mr. Helps has formed his history, without concluding in favour of the simplicity, truth, and earnestness, of a large proportion of the Spanish historians of America. Almost every page of the volumes before us testifies to the Author's intimate familiarity with all the contemporary authorities, and also to his knowledge of the Spanish character generally. The pages are not encumbered with foot notes, but neither do they furnish a dry list of references, which may or may not be accurate for

any opportunity the reader has of determining the fact. Nor on the other hand are we left an appendix, which must either be more bulky than the book itself, or contain only a few lengthy extracts upon matters of engrossing importance. We have rarely seen a better or closer chain of illustrative and authoritative extracts than that which binds together the otherwise somewhat scattered and irregular arrangement of the work. The extracts, just of a convenient length, are very numerous, accompany you throughout, and are full of purpose, application, and character. We think Mr. Helps has exercised a wise discretion in not translating them; several are Portuguese, and several Latin, but the bulk is Spanish, as might have been expected. Now, Spanish is a language which of all others it is almost impossible to translate without a large evaporation of strength, and an almost total loss of savour. And it must be borne in mind besides, that Mr. Helps has frequently embodied in the text the very words of his authorities, so that the general public loses not much, and the work gains a great deal by the course which the author has adopted.

The style of the history, although pleasing in itself, is not precisely according to our taste, because it does not seem to be of the historical order, and we feel bound to say, that although more learned, more trustworthy, and in every way more valuable than Robertson's *America*, "The Spanish Conquest" cannot as a classic compare with that history. Grave subjects are dealt with in a chatty fire-side style, not kept up, it is true, but noticeable more than occasionally, and with now and then a touch of jocularly that reminds one of a paper in household words. At other times whole pages run on after the manner of a review, no contemptible review either, but still not strictly in place, if indeed in place at all. In one instance he adopts a singular, and in a work of this kind we believe quite original way of giving expression to his own opinions regarding what ought to have been the impressions and dealings of the early discoverers of America with reference to the religion and habits of the natives. He supposes an imaginary ship with imaginary adventurers upon an imaginary voyage. He keeps the log, traces the course of the vessel, describes the ports at which she touches, the countries explored, the life, manner, and religion of the natives, with the impression made on the minds of the discoverers. He does all this

with the utmost gravity and with the usual marginal notes, and goes so far as to give the chart of the voyage in his map. We are by no means prepared to say that his views are as eccentric as his methods, but we cannot think that the latter are quite consistent with the dignity of history, which is, or ought to be, one of the most serious compositions in the world. There is also observable another feature which looks very peculiar, and perhaps a little affected. Most of the chapters open with a simile, or illustration, sometimes a little fanciful, sometimes common-place, but often very happy, and in perfect analogy to the contents of the chapter. In a review, or a speech, or a lecture, illustrations of this kind, occurring naturally and growing out of the subject, are extremely effective. But when we meet them in history, or in historical dissertations, so placed that the subject appears, perhaps, to be forced to conform to the analogy, the case is very different. There is, moreover, something like an ostentation of negligence in the style, that betrays the writer into absolute incorrectness, and makes him occasionally not quite intelligible. Neither do we consider his distribution of the subject quite happy, although it is by no means easy to suggest a proper arrangement for a history like that of Spanish America. You have to deal with a number of adventurers let loose at almost the same moment, or at short intervals, upon an immense and varied field of enterprise. You might call their adventures episodes, if there were anything like a main action from which they could be supposed to branch. They were for the most part completely independent, and unconnected, not only as undertakings, but in character and incident. The scene also shifts continually from America to Spain in a way that renders complete unity of plan a thing hardly to be expected; and were it not that Mr. Helps keeps continually in view the subject of slavery, to which the entire history has reference, the confusion would be much more considerable. After all, there is, perhaps, nothing on which criticism has less pretensions to be dogmatic, than the distribution of historical narrative. Some would have it digested through fixed periods of time, while others would complete the history of each event without regard to the number of years through which it runs; and a great deal may be said in favour of both views. For our own part we think that a little management will give not only the appearance, but the substance of order

to any arrangement approving itself to a man of ordinary judgment. Nothing can exceed the smoothness and regularity of Robertson's *America*, although at the same time we are willing to admit that the graces of style and beauty of arrangement are the principal, if not the only perfections of his work.

Perhaps nothing is more strongly brought out in the entire book than the independence and freedom of the Church under one of the most absolute monarchies in existence, or under the still more despotic rule of an entire population confederated in gainful crime, in fact, of a slave-holding community. In the southern States of the American Union, not one voice is raised in favour of the slave. Northern preachers make the attempt, but it is part of their stock-in-trade, and they do so, not because they are preachers, but because they are free soilers and abolitionists; it is an accident of their policy, not of their ministry. Widely different was the conduct of the monks in slave-holding St. Domingo. They congregate the chief slave-holders around the pulpit for the express purpose of hearing their gains declared unholy, and the wages of perdition. It is not the people of Ephesus merely, but the very silversmiths that are collected to hear their Diana blasphemed; and when the Dominican apostles are required to recant their impieties and appease the Goddess, they come forward to confess the one God and to preach in the forbidden name with an utter disregard of consequences. The account of the proceedings as given by Mr. Helps is very characteristic of the time and of the scene, as may readily be noticed. The facts of the narrative are taken from the pen of Las Casas himself, and may therefore be expected to be life-like. The spirit, the energy, the zeal, the resolution, the coolness, the quiet will, and the collected intrepidity of the Dominicans on that occasion have many parallels in their own history, and in that of the Church; such qualities, in fact, are common place, and pass without remark amongst those who know us, but it is pleasing to find them understood and appreciated in other quarters.

"The Dominican Monks of Hispaniola were about twelve or fifteen in number, living under the government of their Vicar Pedro de Cordova. Coming to a new country, they had deepened the severity of their rules so that it kept its own proportion with the general hardness of living throughout the colony. One of their

new rules was, that they would not ask for bread, wine, or oil, except in cases of sickness, and their habitual fare was most scanty and of the poorest description. Being fully intent upon the work they had undertaken, they would soon have comprehended, from their own observation, the extent of evil in the state of things about them; but their insight into the treatment of the Indians was rapidly enlarged, and their opinions confirmed by the acquisition of a new lay-brother. This was a man who had murdered his wife, an Indian woman, and then had fled to the woods, where he remained two years, but on the arrival of the Dominicans in the Island, he sought what refuge from his sin and sorrow could be found under the shadow of their order. This man recounted to his brethren the cruelties he had been witness of, and that narration brought them sooner to the determination they now adopted, which was to make a solemn protest against the ways of their countrymen with the Indians.

"The good Monks determined that their protest should express the general opinions of their body. Accordingly, they agreed amongst themselves upon a discourse to be preached before the inhabitants of St. Domingo, and signed their names to it. They further resolved that brother Antonio Montesinos should be the person to preach; a man, we are told, of great asperity in reprehending vice. In order to secure a fit audience on the occasion, the Monks took care to let the principal persons of St. Domingo know that some address of a remarkable kind, which concerned them much, was to be made to them, and their attendance was requested. The Sunday came. Father Antonio ascended the pulpit, and took for his text a portion of the Gospel of the day, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness."

"There is only a short account of the sermon, but we may be certain that it was an energetic discourse: for indeed when any body has anything to say, he can generally say it worthily. And here, instead of nice points of doctrine (over which, and not unreasonably, you can become eloquent, ingenious, wrathful, intense) was an evil uplifting itself before the eyes of all men, and respecting which neither preacher nor hearers could entrench themselves behind generalities. He told them that the sterile desert was a map of the state of their consciences; and then he told them with "very piercing and terrible words" (*palabras muy pungitivas y terribles*) that the voice pronounced that they were living in mortal sin, by reason of their tyranny to those innocent people the Indians. What authority was there for the imposition of this servitude? what just ground for these wars? How could the colonists rightly insist upon such cruel labours as they did from the Indians, neglecting all care of them, both in the things of heaven and those of earth? Such Spaniards, he declared, had no more chance of salvation than so many Moors or Turks.

"We shall but make a worthy ending to Father Antonio's sermon

if we imagine it to have concluded with words like those used by a very renowned Portuguese preacher on the same subject and a like occasion. 'But you will say to us, this people, this republic, this State cannot be supported without Indians. Who is to bring us a pitcher of water or a bundle of wood? Who is to plant our mandioc? Must our wives do it? Must our children do it? In the first place, as you will presently see, these are not the straits in which I would place you, but if necessity and conscience require it, then I reply, yes you and your wives and your children ought to do it. We ought to support ourselves with our own hands, for better is it to be supported by the sweat of one's own brow than by another's blood. O ye tribes of Maranham! What if these mantles were wrung! they would drop blood.

"If we can turn ourselves back in imagination to that period, and make ourselves present at such a discourse, we might almost hear during it, the occasional clang of arms as men turned eagerly about to one another and vowed that this must not go on any longer. They heard the sermon out, however, and went to dinner. After dinner, the principal persons conferred together for a short time, and then set out for the monastery to make a fierce remonstrance. When they had come to the monastery which, from its poor construction, might rather have been called a shed than a monastery, the Vicar Pedro de Cordova received them, and listened to their complaint. They insisted upon seeing the preacher himself, Father Antonio, declaring that he had preached delirious things, and that he must make reparation next Sunday. A long parley ensued, in the course of which Pedro de Cordova informed the Remonstrants that the sermon did not consist of the words of any one brother but of the whole Dominican Community. The angry deputation exclaimed that if Father Antonio did not unsay what he had said, the Monks had better get ready their goods in order to embark for Spain. 'Of a truth, my lord,' replied the Vicar, 'that will give us little trouble,' which was true enough, for (as Las Casas observes) all that the Monks possessed, their books, clothes, and vestments for the Mass, might have gone into two trunks. At last the colonists went away upon the understanding that the matter would be touched upon next Sunday, and as the remonstrants supposed an ample apology would be offered them.

"The next Sunday came; there was no occasion this time to invite anybody to attend, for all the congregation were anxious to come in the hope of being about to hear an apology to themselves from the pulpit. After Mass, Father Antonio was again seen to ascend the pulpit. He gave out the text from the 36th chapter of Job, the 3rd verse, '*Repetam Scientiam meam a principio et operatorem meum probabo bonum.*' Those of his audience who understood Latin, and were persons of any acuteness, perceived immediately what would be the drift of this sermon, and that it would be no less mischievous to them than the previous one. And so it proved. Father Antonio

only repeated his former statements, clenched his former arguments, and insisted upon his former conclusion. Moreover, he added that the Dominicans would not confess any man who made incursions amongst the Indians:—this the Colonists might publish, and they might write to whom they pleased. The congregation heard Father Antonio out, but this time they did not go to the monastery, but they determined to send a complaint to the King, and afterwards to despatch a Franciscan monk (monk against monk) to argue their case at Court. Hitherto the Colonists had already sent two agents to plead for having the Indians assigned to their *Encomenderos* for two or three lives, or even in perpetuity."—Vol. I., pp. 247-252.

The result of the embassy was pretty much the same as that of all similar proceedings on the part of those who interfered on behalf of the natives. The court usually admitted the justice of their appeal, condemned the cruelty and avarice of the colonists, appointed visitors and inspectors to redress the grievances of the Indians, and does in truth seem to have wished to interpose for their protection. But the interposition of the central government was rarely of any avail. The Council of the Indies sat under the pretence of administering the dead letter of various wise and provident regulations which had from time to time been drawn up to quiet the importunity of Las Casas, but which never went to the root of the evil, and for a considerable period members of the Council had a direct interest in the perpetuation of the slave system, inasmuch as many of them had themselves received allotments of slaves. The indefatigable Las Casas put an end to that scandal, but the Council was none the better disposed to put in force the existing restraints upon the cupidity of the settlers, much less to frame new laws for such a purpose. On the other hand, it was impossible for the King to give to his Indian empire the attention which its importance, rightly understood, would have required. He was obliged to entrust its administration to others, and as is often the case, was not wise, or at all events was not fortunate in his choice of servants. His European empire was quite enough to absorb all his individual labour, and his intellect, although not of a common order, was far from equal to the government of such a state at such a period. Under all these circumstances it is not surprising that so small a measure of success attended the efforts of Las Casas. The attempt recorded in the following extracts is one of the boldest in history.

We should have to wait a long time before the Hon. and Rev. John Doe, or the Venerable Richard Roe, with six more of her majesty's chaplains, would force their way into the India house, denounce the torture of the Hindoos, and call things by their proper names, without the slightest dread of offending ears polite by the mention of unpolite truths.

"It has been a common practice at courts to have certain set preachers. In the Spanish court at this time there were eight preachers to the king, and Las Casas bethought himself of laying his troubles, and the wrongs of the Indians before these ecclesiastics, and begging their favour and assistance. I will here give their names, as I think we ought not to grudge naming men who, although they come but once or twice before us, and speak but a few words in the great drama of history, do so in a way that ought to confer reputation upon them. First, then, there were the brothers Coronel, Maestro Luiz and Maestro Antonio, both very learned men, Doctors of the University of Paris. Then there was Miguel de Salamanca, also a doctor of the same university, and a Master in Theology, afterwards Bishop of Cuba; then Doctor De La Fuente, a celebrated man in the time of the late Cardinal Ximenes, of his university of Alcalá, then Brother Alonso de Leon, of the Franciscan Order, very learned in theology, Brother Dionysius, of the Order of St. Augustine, 'a great preacher, and very copious in eloquence.' The names of the other two Las Casas had forgotten.

"The King's preachers and Las Casas formed a junta of their own. They admitted one or two other *religiosos* into it, a brother of the Queen of Scotland being one of them. This last-mentioned noble Monk was one of those who had come over from Picardy in the year 1516 or 1517, and who had himself gained great experience of the proceedings of the Spaniards on the coast of Cumanà. The bold Scot wished to propose to the junta a large question of the most searching and fundamental nature, namely, 'With what justice or right an entrance could be made into the Indies, after the manner which the Spaniards adopted in entering those countries.'

"Each day the junta thus constituted met at the monastery of Santa Catalina, and were, as the historian describes, a sort of antagonist council to that held daily on Indian affairs under the presidency of the Bishop of Burgos. They met at the same hour as the Indian Council, perhaps to evade observation, for I imagine their proceedings were kept quite secret.

"The conclusion this junta came to was, that they were obliged, by the divine law, to undertake to procure a remedy for the evils of the Indies, and they bound themselves to each other by oath that none of them were to be dismayed or to desist from the undertaking until it should be accomplished.

"They resolved to begin by 'the evangelical form of fraternal correction.' First, they were to go and admonish the Council of the Indies; if that had no effect, they would then admonish the Chancellor; if he were obdurate, they would admonish Monsieur Chièvres; and if none of these admonitions addressed to the officers of the crown were of any avail, they would finally go to the King and admonish him.

"If all these earthly powers turned a deaf ear to admonition, they, the brothers, would then preach publicly against all of these great men, not omitting to give his due share of blame to the King himself.

"This resolution drawn up in writing, they subscribed to, and they swore upon the cross and the Gospel to carry out their resolve.

* * * * *

"On a certain day entering the Council of the Indies suddenly, to the great astonishment of the Bishop of Burgos and the rest of the Council, the preachers requested leave to speak, and Brother Miguel de Salamanca, the eldest of them, made an earnest and explicit speech, in which he said that he and his brethren were aware of the cruelties and wrongs which had been committed in the Indies, by which the Christian religion was defamed, and that the Indies were being depopulated to the disgrace of the crown, 'for, as the Scripture says, 'in the multitude of the people consists the dignity and honour of the King.'* Then after saying that the preachers wondered how such things had happened in the Indies, considering the merits and prudence of the council, he added, that they knew not on whom to lay the blame, except upon the persons who had been charged with the government of those parts for many years. Then he alleged that the office of preachers in the court was such as to make it incumbent on them to impugn anything that might be contrary to the Divine Majesty; wherefore they had come to inquire how such evils had been permitted, without a remedy having been provided for them, and to see how some remedy might now be provided. Finally, declaring that divine reward would attend upon the Council if they did provide a remedy, and punishment if they did not, he concluded with an apology for the appearance in the Council-room of himself and the brothers.

"Up rose the Bishop of Burgos, and with all the majestic pride of an ancient priest, 'as if they had come in the times of the Gentiles to pull down the temple of Apollo,' thus replied, 'Great is your presumption and audacity, to come and correct the council of the king. Casas is at the bottom of this business. Who gave the

* In multitudine populi dignitas regis: et in paucitate plebis ignominia principis.—Lib. Prov. cap. xiv.

king's preachers authority to meddle in the matters of government, which the king transacts through his councils? The king does not give you bread for that, but for you to preach the Gospel to him.'

"Hereupon Doctor de la Fuente replied: 'In this business *Casas* is not concerned, but the *Casa* (house) of God, whose servants we are, and in whose defence we are bound, and are ready to lay down our lives. Does it appear to your Lordship to be presumption, that eight masters in theology, who might go and exhort a general council in things pertaining to the faith, and to the government of the universal Church, should come and exhort the King's Council? We have power to come and admonish the Councils of the King, in respect of what they may do wrong, for it is our office to be of the Council of the King. And for this we have come here, my Lords, namely, to exhort you, and to require that you amend the great errors and injustices that are committed in the Indies, to the perdition of so many souls, and with such offence to God. And unless you do amend these things, my Lords, we shall preach against you as against those who do not keep God's laws, and who do that which is not convenient for the service of the King. And this, my Lords, is to preach the Gospel and to fulfil it.'

"Doctor de la Fuente, of Alcalá, seems to have imbibed some of the force and directness of the great founder of his university, the late Cardinal Ximenes. The Council were astonished at the Doctor's bold words, and began to soften down a little. Don Garcia de Padilla, now taking up the controversy, said, 'This Council does its duty, and has made many very good provisions for the benefit of the Indies, which shall be shown to you, although your presumption does not deserve it, that you may see how great is your rashness and pride.'

"To this Dr. de la Fuente replied: 'My Lords, you have but to show us these provisions, and if they should be good and just, we shall admit them to be so; but if bad and unjust, we shall give to the Devil them and whoever would sustain and not amend them, and we do not believe that your Lordships will be amongst those persons.'

"Finally, after some other talk upon the part of the Council, and probably with a little more mildness on the other side, it was concluded that the preachers should come the next day and hear the provisions which had been made for the benefit of the Indies.

"Accordingly, they did come, and heard the numerous provisions read, which, from the earliest times of the Catholic Sovereigns downwards, had been made on the subject, but which unhappily had been carried into execution by persons of a very different temper of mind from that of the statesmen, philanthropists, and monarchs, who had been concerned in issuing the various ordinances. When the preachers had heard these official documents

read, they asked for time to deliver their opinions in writing. This opinion comes handed down to us, not by a speech put into their mouths by some imaginative historian, nor does it rest merely on the Clerigo's recollection, but when he wrote his history he had before him the copy of the preachers opinion in the handwriting of Brother Miguel, who was the Secretary of this Clerical junta.

"The document differs in some considerable respects from the opinions of Las Casas, which shows that the preachers exercised an independent judgment. They commence with a graceful and modest exordium, in which they recount the mode of their interference in this matter, praise the laws that had been read to them on their second attendance at the Council, but at the same time intimate their opinion of the insufficiency of these laws. Their Lordships, they add, are not to wonder if a remedy for the evil should come to them from without, 'from an alien hand,' seeing that Moses, highly favoured of God as he was, yet received counsel of an Idolator, touching the government of the Israelites; and that St. Peter had need of the eloquence of Apollos, and of consultation with the rest of the Apostolic body.

"Then they declare that, though far from arrogating to themselves, that they are the persons chosen by God to instruct the Council; yet that they are, as it were, the eyes of the Court, that while their Lordships are spiritually asleep 'in the depths of temporal business,' they, the preachers are, or, as they delicately phrase it, should be studying the law of God in order to expound it to the Court, and they add significantly, that if they had done their duty perhaps there would not be so much corruption in many things as there is.

"They then proceed to the business in hand, and admitting that the laws which were read to them were excellent laws provided there were to be such a thing as a *repartimiento*, and provided the laws in question could be executed, which they thought never could be, they come at once to the root of the matter and pronounce that the cause of all the evil in the Indies is the system of giving the Indians in *repartimiento*. It is contrary, they say, to worldly prudence, to the service of the King, to civil and canonical law, to the rules of moral philosophy, and to the laws of God and of His Church.

"While such a thing exists, they ask, can the evil of these colonies be repaired by any laws that can be made?

"They then go into proof upon all the points they have raised against the system of giving the Indians in *repartimiento*. Upon the first point, namely, of this practice being contrary to worldly prudence, they advance the following argument well worthy of attention. This system, they say, prevents the existence of a State, 'which according to all those who had written of it, consists in diversity of conditions and offices.' Who ever heard, they ask, of a great digging republic (*república cavadora*) in which there are no soldiers,

philosophers, lawyers, official men, or other kind of labourers than those who dig?

"They afterwards go into the civil and political branch of the argument, and utterly contravene the notion that this system of *repartimientos* is consistent with freedom. What King who ever lived, they asked, compelled his people to work more than nine months of the year for him, or for others? Upon this branch of the argument they lay much stress, and they say, 'we hold (would to God that it may not be so) that this great sin (the system of *repartimientos* or *encomiendas*) will be the cause of the total destruction of the State of Spain if God does not alter it, or if we do not put an end to it ourselves.'

"The preachers then fairly demolished the supposition that visitors can correct abuses. Why, if those visitors were angels, and neither ate, nor slept, nor received gifts, they would not check abuses which the fears of the Indians themselves would always throw a cloak over; and who are those visitors? Persons looking upon the masters whose doings they come to inspect as men, perhaps as friends and benefactors, but upon the Indians as beasts.

"The preachers then enter upon most dangerous ground as we should conceive it, only that there was a great deal more freedom of speech in those days than we are apt to imagine. They contend that *repartimientos* are an injury to the King because they destroy his title; and they lay down the doctrine, that a King's title depends upon his rendering services to his people, or upon his being chosen by them. Now the establishment of those *repartimientos* is not a service to the Indian people, and therefore the King has no title to be their sovereign on account of the services rendered to them; no one can say that the Indians have chosen him for their sovereign; and, therefore, where is the King's title?"—vol. II. pp. 46-59.

The preachers then proceed to supply the remedy for the abuses they have denounced. Their proposal is to accustom the Indians gradually to civil life by forming them into small settlements, under a mild and equitable rule, and with proper guarantees against tyranny or other abuses of power. A moderate amount of work should be required of them at the mines, and after the payment of taxes, the produce of their farms should be their own. Mr. Helps is right in characterizing their project as "a remarkable state paper, sagacious, humane, and bold."

It is not our business to advocate the administration of secular government by churchmen. We certainly do believe, that as far as their own salvation is concerned, it would be promoted far more effectually by the government of their flocks than by the government of empires. Still

less are we concerned, at this moment, to defend the principle of an ecclesiastical state like that of Rome. Its reason of existence is altogether independent and abnormal, and it is to be defended under a particular law and peculiar equities; but it is one of the most contemptible fallacies of a saucy and shallow age to say, that churchmen, as such, are less qualified than others to take part in the administration of affairs. Some of them have done their own share of mischief, but, in general, their government has been characterized by as much genius and success as that of laymen. We look upon the foreign policy of Cardinal Richelieu as the most wickedly unchristian and uncatholic it is possible to conceive; we believe it to have contained the germs of the subsequent misfortunes of France; but looking into the vigour and intelligence of his internal administration, and to the effect which he was enabled to give to his own views; bearing in mind for the moment that to lower the House of Austria was the traditional policy of France, and not requiring of Richelieu to be more far seeing than any other statesman of the time; we affirm that he would not suffer by comparison with any layman of any period. Somewhat the same may be said of Mazarin, and a good deal more for Ximenes, but we think that the views of Las Casas and the King's preachers, and the results which, by these volumes, are shewn to have flowed from the adoption of a contrary policy, are proof sufficient that the statesmanship of churchmen and monks in the catholic period of Spanish history, was very superior to that of the most enlightened laymen of the age.

It is a remark of Montaigne that the sole triumph of some conceptions lies in the disaster which has ensued upon their realization not having been allowed. This is very fully illustrated by the history of Spanish America, and more particularly so if we read it by the light of our own experience in the history of British India. Upon the score of morality in general, and of good faith, right, and humanity in particular, we have no right to claim superiority over the Spaniards. The Spaniards have been more sanguinary, we have been more cruel, the Spaniards more violent, we more insidious, the Spaniards sacrificed life, we applied torture, the Spaniards killed their hen for the glut of the golden eggs, and we blinded the linnet for the improvement of its song. Our wisdom, less wise however

than that of Las Casas and the preachers, has been made manifest by our success, by a constant increase of dominion, by never-failing lacs of rupees, and by the provision of a field to absorb the surplus of ambition and activity that must always exist in a highly organized and populous community like ours. The want of some such issue for enterprise and talent is greatly felt in France for instance. Every secular profession is there overpacked, every career is in plethora, the dignity of each and all their rewards are lowered by infinite competition, and every channel that civilized society has provided for usefully distributing the talents of its members, is choked and impassable. All that would otherwise flow off and expose a beneficial activity upon the antipodes, is thrown back upon the country and subsides into present uselessness and future danger; for the waters, although apparently stagnant, are always rising, and will one day burst their barrier unless some provision be made to draw them off. Had we followed the example of the Spaniards, and killed off our Indians by the million, were the present rice fields abandoned to the alligator and the boa, and the cities of men laid fallow for a growth of jungle, what profit would our Indian Empire bring to us? Our cruelties, our perfidy, our exactions, were, and perhaps are, such as Burke and Sheridan have described, but we were too smart to butcher after the Spanish fashion. In England we believe religion never raised her voice in behalf of the miserable natives; but the fact is, at all events, that the native population has been preserved, and our Empire is what it is.

Let us therefore suppose that the millions who positively swarmed in the Mexican and Peruvian Empires, had been preserved in conformity with the advice of Las Casas and the preachers. They were a far more promising population than the natives of the Indian Empire, to whose conversion and civilization the diversity of castes presents so great an obstacle. The Indians of the two former Empires already possessed considerable mechanical skill; their military qualities were, to say the least, far from contemptible; their faith and simplicity were very great; they were susceptible of feelings of the strongest attachment to their benefactors; they had already a superstitious reverence for their princes; they readily adopted, and thoroughly understood the principles

of Christianity; there was nothing to prevent their consolidation into a great, an enlightened, and a loyal empire, not through the tedious process of colonization, but by the influence of religion and civil polity, upon a large, an intelligent, and a willing population. Their natural increase, no longer kept under by their savage wars, and by the human sacrifices which formed the principal feature of the Mexican superstition, would not have been excessive, because the improved methods of agriculture applied to a soil of such wonderful fertility, would have maintained the proportion between demand and supply, and have left a large surplus for the purposes of commerce. It is hardly an extreme proposition to affirm that, under these circumstances, the entire of both the American Continents must have been included in the Spanish Empire, and would now have been covered by a Christian population, Indian and European, more numerous than that of China, and yielding a revenue greater than that of all the kingdoms of the earth together. Imagination can hardly compass the grandeur of the possibilities which the councils of Las Casas and the Preachers could have converted into reality. Nor on the other hand are we prepared to say that the present pitiable condition of a nation, which might be so great as Spain, is not the very chastisement which the Preachers foretold should overtake the people of Spain for their destruction of the Indies, and their rejection of the grandest opportunity ever presented to a Christian State. The English in North America had no such materials to work upon, and no such materials to work with, as the Spaniards in Mexico and South America. The North American Indians were fierce, untractable, and almost *feræ naturæ* as compared with the Mexicans, or Peruvians, and their kindred tribes. And had they been as plastic as wax, England was just in the most truculent period of her Protestantism, and could never have moulded them to anything. Again, in India Proper there was still less chance of successful dealing with the population from the peculiar character of their superstition, and from the complete but stunted growth of their civilization, while the instruments were as poor, and the inclination to use them as little as in the case of America. There can hardly be any doubt that the neglected opportunity was almost as great a crime in Spain as the positive wickedness of the Spanish government in America, and certainly the exist-

ing condition of Spain, and of the Spanish colonies, falls little short of that total destruction which the Preachers foretold as the punishment of their cruelty to the Indians. A life of intermittent fear is the only thing to which the condition of these countries, otherwise so favoured, can be compared. Ever in revolution, or on the verge of it, ever balancing between anarchy and despotism, never out of the hot or the cold fit, constantly declining in strength, respectability, wealth and population, the wreck of the Spanish Empire in America, and the remnant of it in Europe, do offer the most mournful spectacle presented by any living nation. Indeed, we think it is rather a confirmation of this view, that the Colonies, which were the chief criminals in the treatment of the Indians, suffer more severely than the Mother Country, whose guilt was certainly far less. In Spain there is occasionally something like a promise of order and stability, but hardly anywhere is such a thing to be seen in the South American Republics. We hope it may not be so, but the prophecy of the Preachers seems likely to be fulfilled in the total extinction and absorption of the Spanish States by the great freebooting republic of the North.

Mr. Helps, in the course of his history, goes at considerable length into the proceedings of the Spanish Dominicans and Franciscans,—the principal missionary bodies in action at the period to which his work reaches. The facts prove beyond cavil that the conversion of the entire Continent would have been not only possible, but easy, had the infatuation of the Colonists been less obstinate. Whenever a momentary respite was granted to the natives, and a fair field to the missionaries, their success was complete. The Author gives one striking instance of this, in the conversion and subjugation of a fierce and resolute province, by four Friars. The passage is somewhat lengthy, but we are unwilling to curtail it.

“After the manner of pious men in those times, Las Casas and his monks did not fail to commence their undertaking, by having recourse to the most fervent prayers, severe fasts, and other mortifications. These lasted several days. They then turned to the secular part of their enterprise, using all the skill that the most accomplished statesmen or men of the world could have brought to bear upon it. The first thing they did was to translate into verse, in the Quiché language, the great doctrines of the Church. In these verses they described the creation of the world, the fall of

man, his banishment from Paradise, and the mediation prepared for him; then the life of Christ, His passion, His death, His resurrection, His ascension; then His future return to judge all men, the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the good. They divided the work, which was very extensive, into *coplas*, after the Castilian fashion. We might well wish for many reasons that this laudable work remained to us, but I am not aware of there being any traces of its existence.

"The good fathers then began to study how they should introduce their poems to the notice of the Indians of Tuzulutlan, and availing themselves of a happy thought for this purpose, they called to their aid four Indian merchants, who were in the habit of going with merchandise four times a-year into this province, called the 'Land of War.' The monks with great care taught these four men to repeat the couplets which they had composed. The pupils entered entirely into the views of their instructors. Indeed, they took such pains in learning their lessons, (and with the fine sense for musical intonation which the Indians generally possessed) repeated those verses so well that there was nothing left to desire. The composition and the teaching occupied three months, and was not completed until the middle of August, 1537. Las Casas communicated his undertaking to Domingo de Bertansos, now the head of the Dominican Order in New Spain, who was delighted to give his sanction and his blessing to the good work. The monks and the merchants, however, were not satisfied until they had brought their labours to much greater perfection, until, indeed, they had set these verses to music, so that they might be accompanied by the Indian instruments, taking care, however, to give the voice parts a higher place in the scale than that of the deep-toned instruments of the natives. No doubt this music was a great improvement upon anything the Indians had ever heard in the way of sweet sounds.

"The enterprize was now ready to be carried into action, to be transplanted from the schools into the world. It was resolved that the merchants should commence their journey into the Land of War, carrying with them not only their own merchandise, but being furnished by Las Casas with the usual smallwares to please the aborigines, such as scissors, knives, looking glasses, and bells. The pupils and the teachers parted, the merchants making their accustomed journey into the provinces of Quiché and Zacapula, their destination being a certain *pueblo* of a great Cacique of those parts, a wise and warlike chief, who had many great alliances.* * *

"The merchants were received, as was the custom in a country without inns, into the palace of the Cacique, where they met with a better reception than usual, being able to make him presents of their new things from Castille. They then set up their tent and began to sell their goods as they were wont to do, their customers thronging about them to see the Spanish novelties. When the sale

was over for that day, the chief men among the Indians remained with the Cacique to do him honour. In the evening the merchants asked for a '*teplanastle*,' an instrument of music, which we may suppose to have been the same as the Mexican *teponaztli*, or drum. They then produced some timbrels and bells which they had brought with them, and began to sing the verses which they had learned by heart, accompanying themselves on the musical instruments. The effect produced was very great. The sudden change of character not often made, from a merchant to a priest, at once arrested the attention of the assemblage. Then, if the music was beyond anything these Indians had heard, the words were still more extraordinary; for the good fathers had not hesitated to put into their verses the questionable assertion that idols were demons, and the certain fact that human sacrifices were abominable. The main body of the audience was delighted, and pronounced these messengers to be ambassadors from new gods.

"The Cacique, with the caution of a man in authority, suspended his judgment until he heard more of the matter. The next day, and for seven succeeding days the sermon in song was repeated. In public and in private the person who insisted most on this repetition was the Cacique; and he expressed a wish to fathom the matter and to know the origin and the meaning of these things. The prudent merchants replied that they only sung what they had heard; that it was not their business to explain their reasons, for that office belonged to certain *padres* who instructed the people. 'And who are *padres*?' asked the chief. In answer to this the merchant painted pictures of the Dominican monks in their robes of black and white, and with their tonsured heads. The merchants then described the lives of these *padres*, how they did not eat meat, and how they did not desire gold or feathers or cocoa; that they were not married, and had no communication with women; that night and day they sang the praises of God, and that they knelt before very beautiful images. Such were the persons the merchants said who could and would explain these couplets; they were such good people, and so ready to teach, that if the Cacique were to send for them they would most willingly come.

"The Indian chief resolved to see and hear these marvellous men in black and white with their hair in the form of a garland, who were so different from other men, and for this purpose, when the merchants returned he sent in company with them a brother of his, a young man twenty-two years of age, who was to invite the Dominicans to visit his brother's country, and to carry them presents. The cautious Cacique instructed his brother to look well to the ways of these *padres*, to observe whether they had gold and silver like other Christians, and whether there were women in their houses. These instructions having been given and his brother having taken his departure, the Cacique made large offerings of incense and great sacrifices to his idols for the success of the embassy.

"On the arrival of this company at Santiago, Las Casas and the Dominican monks received the young Indian chief with every demonstration of welcome, and it need hardly be said with what joy they heard from the merchants who accompanied him of the success of their mission.

"While the Indian prince was occupied in visiting the town of Santiago, the monks debated amongst themselves what course they should pursue in reference to the invitation which they had received from the Cacique. Their choice fell upon Father Luis Cancér, who was probably the most skilled of all the four in the language that was best likely to be understood in Tuzulutlan. Meanwhile the Cacique's brother and his attendants made their observations upon the mode of life of the monks, who gratified him and them by little presents. It was now time to return, and the whole party, consisting of Luis Cancér, the Cacique's brother, his Indians, and the four merchants of Guatemala, set off from Santiago on their way to the Cacique's country. Luis Cancér carried with him a present for the Cacique in fabrics of Castille, and also some crosses and images. The reason for carrying these latter is that the Cacique might read in these what he might forget in the sermons which would be preached to him. The journey of Father Luis was a continued triumph. Everywhere the difference was noticed between his dress, customs, and manners, and those of the Spaniards who had already been seen in Tuzulutlan. When he came into the Cacique's territory he was received under triumphal arches, and the ways were made clean before him as if he had been another Montezuma traversing his kingdom. At the entrance of the Cacique's own town, the chief himself came out to meet Father Luis, and bending before him cast down his eyes shewing him the same marks of reverence that he would have shewn to the priests of that country. More substantial and abiding honours soon followed. At the Cacique's orders a church was built, and in it the Father said mass in the presence of the chief, who was especially delighted with the cleanliness of the sacramental garments, for the priests of his own country, like those of Mexico, affected filth and darkness, the fitting companions of a religion of terror.

"Meanwhile Father Luis continued to explain the Christian creed, having always a most attentive and favourable hearer in the Cacique. The good monk had taken the precaution to bring with him the written agreement signed by the governor, and he explained to the chief the favourable conditions that it contained for the welfare of the Indians. The merchants were witnesses who might be appealed to for the meaning of the document, and that they were faithful to the monks, indeed, a sort of lay-brotherhood, may be inferred from the fact of their continuing to chaunt every evening the verses which had won for them at first the title of ambassadors from new Gods. The Cacique's brother gave a favourable report of what he had seen at Santiago, and

the result of all these influences on the mind of the Indian chieftain was such that he determined to embrace the Christian faith. No sooner had he become a proselyte than with all the zeal and energy belonging to that character, he began to preach the new doctrine to his own vassals, he was the first to pull down and burn his idols, and many of his chiefs, in imitation of their master, became Iconoclasts."—vol. III. pp. 341 350.

We do no more than justice to Mr. Helps when we say, that he has rendered good service to the cause of truth and humanity by the history of Spanish America. He has for the first time brought clearly before the English public the merits and the sacrifices of men whom that public has been in the habit of connecting with no other ideas than those of venison and sack, alternating with the *auto da fe*, and with chamber practice of torture in the vaults of the Inquisition. He has also shewn the action of the Church generally upon the question of modern slavery, and proved, as we think, very convincingly, that slavery draws with it its own punishment. He has only had occasion to touch incidentally upon the question of negro slavery, if we except a chapter or two in the first volume, where he deals with the Portuguese discoveries in Africa. We do not believe for our own part that the American public can ever be reached by argument, or softened by compassion, upon this subject; and we make no account whatever of the abolitionism of the North, which we consider to be prompted by geographical and political considerations merely, in the absence of any motive of religion or humanity. The social problem will work itself out, not interrupted by any disturbing influence from Europe. In the present state of American society religion has no voice whatever in the matter. Throughout the Slave States, the system finds no more earnest or practical supporters than the ministers of the Protestant denominations; and in the North their patronage of the slave is valued at its exact worth, and no more. The slaves are under the protection of God but not under that of religion. No *Las Casas* can ever plead for them; he would get a baptism of tar and be ridden upon a rail if he made the attempt. You can no more hope to influence American slavery by tracts or essays than to quench Cotopaxi with a garden can. The social and the physical volcano will each play its part upon America, do its allotted measure of havoc, and burn out in process of time. But studies and labours such as those of Mr.

Helps can never be barren of profit to ourselves at home. Whatever dissipates prejudice and vindicates truth, ought to be precious in the eyes of society. We are happy to recognize in the public mind the existence of a very general desire to come at the essence of facts. There is an undoubted demand for genuine history. Where such is provided, increase of appetite will be sure to grow by what it feeds on. Mr. Helps, we trust, has only interrupted his labours. Great events and pregnant lessons have undoubtedly been crowded into the few years over which the history is spread; but enterprizes of charity and philanthropy still more daring, successes yet more startling, reverses yet more sad, remain to be recorded by the historian of Spanish America. The rise and fall of the Jesuit settlements in Paraguay, and the subsequent effect of the general suppression of these missions on the continent of America, are almost quite unknown to the English public, and we have little doubt that if brought to light by an historian of such good faith and discernment as Mr. Helps, they cannot fail of producing the happiest results upon the minds of all who are accessible to reason and conviction.

ART. III.—1. *Caroli Passaglia e. Soc. Jesu, &c. De Ecclesia Christi Commentariorum Libri quinque.* Ratisbon: 1853-1857. Vols. I. and II.

2. *The Church of the Bible: or Scripture Testimonies to Catholic Doctrines and Catholic Principles, collected and considered, in a Series of Popular Discourses, addressed chiefly to non-Catholics.* By Frederick Oakeley, M. A., Priest of the Diocese of Westminster. London: Charles Dolman, 1857.

WE have placed together two works which come before us with very different pretensions. The first is a learned and elaborate theological commentary upon the Church, or rather, we should say, it is two volumes of a treatise which, when completed, will constitute the most able scriptural and dogmatic commentary on the Church hitherto published. It enters with much minuteness, and

with considerable ability, into questions of biblical criticism; and as Professor Passaglia is a critic of great fairness, as well as great erudition, his work will thus supply the defects of preceding treatises on the same subject. While it possesses this additional advantage, that instead of wearying the reader by stating innumerable objections and difficulties, it simply lays down broad general principles, which, when once apprehended, can be applied, as necessary, to particular cases. A work like this, entering, as it does, with such accurate care into the scriptural proof of the Catholic Church, is of much value in a protestant country like England. It will be found to supply the most abundant materials for catechisings, lectures, sermons, and sound controversial discussions. Some may, perhaps, be deterred from attempting the perusal of this commentary by the form in which it is published, and by the style in which it is written; but we can assure them that these are very slight difficulties, and that they will be more than amply repaid by the profound ideas and the just principles to be gleaned from these volumes. As to the particular style of the Latin, it is more ornate and more elaborate than in ordinary theological works; but while we ourselves have a natural preference for the easier and simpler style of Bellarmine or Suarez, we think it very small, indeed, to object against a great professor, that his Latin is composed with elaborate care; and yet this is all to which the objection, as we have sometimes heard it stated, really comes. It is true that Professor Passaglia's Latin is elaborately written, and is interspersed with too many Greek words, giving it, now and then, an air of pedantry, which is as alien as possible to his own real character. But this is, after all, a very slight defect, and we can assure our more timid readers that they will find his Latin to be neither very difficult nor unpleasing.*

* We should recommend this treatise (when completed) to be popularised and published in an English form. There is no one so well qualified to undertake this task as Mr. Allies, who might make it a companion to his excellent volume on St. Peter. We do not mean that Mr. Allies should simply translate Professor Passaglia's work. This would not be so desirable or useful. But taking the work before us as a foundation, he might favour us with one which should contain the ideas and principles here laid down, enriched by the result of his own learning and study.

Mr. Oakeley's volume seems to us to be exactly what it professes to be—a series of popular lectures, shewing the connection between the Bible and the Church, and which are calculated to be of considerable benefit to the class of persons for whom they are intended. They are popular lectures, in contradistinction to a formal theological treatise; but it is easy to perceive, from the care with which they are written, from the line of many of the arguments, and from the whole tone of the volume, that they are directed to minds of a higher class than those of the very poor—to men of thought and refinement, who are familiar with the letter of Scripture, and have some acquaintance with the controversies of the day. We anticipate for these lectures a wide circulation, and recommend them with the utmost sincerity. They bear evidence of having cost their author considerable thought; and although in a volume consisting of sixteen discourses, it is not to be expected that every lecture should be written with equal power, yet many of them will be found conclusive in their argument, while they are all full of interest and instruction. The spirit too, in which they are written, deserves particular commendation. If our tractarian friends sometimes find fault with the supposed “bitterness” of converts, they certainly can bring no charge of this kind against Mr. Oakeley's Lectures, which breathe a tenderness and gentleness of tone in addressing those whom he calls “non-Catholics,” that is in the highest degree praiseworthy, if it do not pass its just limits. But here we must confess to entertaining a suspicion that, in his desire to be fair and charitable towards his “non-Catholic” audience, Mr. Oakeley has approached very close to the extreme of these limits. It may arise from a fault of our own less-charitable disposition; but, in perusing these lectures, we seemed to ourselves to detect now and then a sort of apologetic tone used in defence of the Church and her doctrines, leaving upon our minds a confused suspicion that the presumption, at first sight, was against the Church and in favour of the protestants. But there is really no one who feels more deeply than Mr. Oakeley, that of all the institutions in the world, the Catholic Church stands the least in need of an apology. According to all just principles of reason and of law, it has every thing on its side. It has prescription, antiquity, and “possession” in its favour; and instead of defending

itself, the *onus probandi* lies upon those who have deserted its banner, and who ought always to be called upon to shew cause why they should not confess their fault, and seek reconciliation with the Church. This is a vantage ground which belongs, of right, to a Catholic in every controversy; and it would be mistaken kindness, as well as an error in judgment, ever to cede it to the adversary.

We must hazard another criticism upon Mr. Oakeley's introductory Lecture, which, if made without hesitation, is at all events made without any strong reliance upon the soundness of our own judgment. We confess, that in addressing protestants, we should have taken a different line about the Bible from that adopted by the Author before us. Although Mr. Oakeley states his own view with the caution natural to a careful theologian, he still puts it forward as conceivable and in accordance with fact, that the Scriptures as now collected into a volume, may be *intended* to serve the purpose of leading the learner up to his true authoritative and final teacher; and hence, the title of his lecture, the *Providential* use of the Bible to non-Catholics. He also, in the course of the lecture, in addressing his protestant audience, uses the expressions, "your own Scriptures," and "your Bible." Now we would take the liberty of saying, with the greatest respect for Mr. Oakeley's judgment, and with a high opinion of his general theological accuracy, that there appears to us to be a real distinction between what is directly *providential*, and what is merely *permissive*. It often happens that good may come out of evil, but the evil itself is never directly ordained by Divine Providence. It is, on the contrary, a violation of the Will of that Providence, and in opposition to what it really intended. In like manner, we can conceive good to result accidentally from the protestant use of the Bible; but we should still be reluctant to admit that this use of the Bible was in any direct and formal sense *providential*. Nor could we ever consent to allow the Scriptures to be so appropriated by the protestants as to be rightly called their own Scriptures and their Bible. The truth is, that in no sense are they their own Scriptures. They no more belong to them, than do the *Te Deum*, the *Veni Creator Spiritus*, and the hymns and collects which they have taken from the Office-books of the Catholic Church. In strict theological truth, it must be said, that those who are alien to the Church,

have *purloined* the Scriptures, as well as many of the doctrines and ceremonies which appertain, by divine right, to the Church alone; and as no act of theft can, in its nature, be the direct object of a providential arrangement, so the protestant world can never establish its right to hold, disseminate, or read the Scriptures. The Catholic Church is indeed unable to prevent them from doing so. It may, moreover, endeavour to turn this reading to their spiritual benefit; still it does not in the abstract admit their right; and therefore it can only *accidentally* happen, that good to the soul, and reconciliation with the Church can eventuate from the protestant perusal of the Bible. Mr. Oakeley will probably think this opinion too severe and rigid, and should it be proved so we shall be happy to retract it; but it must be remembered that this is the line adopted by Tertullian in his book on the prescriptions; and if it be a true position, it ought never to be abandoned.

We have united the treatise of Dr. Passaglia with the Lectures of Mr. Oakeley, because they each contain many great merits of their own: they are both occupied with the text of the Sacred Scriptures; and they have each supplied us with the thoughts upon the nature and fortunes of the Church, for which we now solicit our readers' attention.

Among such protestants as profess to believe in the existence of any visible Christian Body at all, the Church is usually defined to be a Society, which is divine, indeed, so far as it was called into being by the will of God, but which is human in every other respect;—in its organization, its institutions, its powers, and its properties. Another School, influenced by a higher tone of feeling, and imbued with sympathies and longings, strongly disposing it towards the Catholic religion, would regard the Church of Christ as a Society, which is *human* in its organic constitution, its national ramifications, and its outward conformation; but which is *divine*, in the fact of having been founded by a divine Person, in the end for which it was called into existence, and in the *external* assistance which it receives from time to time, whereby it is prevented from lapsing into error, and is enabled faithfully to fulfil its high and holy office. But both these definitions fall with harshness upon Catholic ears. The former is manifestly heretical, while the latter, to say the least, is false and inadequate. The Catholic conception

of the Church is something very much deeper and grander. The Church, as we Catholics regard it, is no merely human association, assisted by a divine help, coming to it altogether from without. It is not, for this reason, only a divine Society because it has had a divine founder; nor because the end was supernatural on account of which it has been called into being; its claims to "a participation of the divine nature" stand upon a higher ground. Viewed in its ontological entity, the Church of Christ is a Body, in which the human and the divine coalesce and form, as it were, one Person, in the same way as the human and the divine natures in Christ are united in the One divine Person of the Son of God; and in the same way as the soul and the body in man are the properties of one and the same living person. It is this conception of the Catholic Church which distinguishes it from the ancient Synagogue of the Jews, as well as from all societies whose origin is simply human. The Jewish Church had its foundation in that Divine Providence which chose a particular nation to be the recipients of His special heavenly graces, and to be the guardians of the true religion. It was, moreover, protected and defended by the power of God; and, in many remarkable ways, it received extraneous assistance from heaven, given in order to preserve it as an uncorrupted witness to the Truth. But the Synagogue of the Jews never laid claim to the prerogatives and the privileges that are the birthright of the Catholic Church, which she has ever asserted as her own, and which have been distinctly secured to her by the promises contained in the Sacred Scriptures. The reason is plain. It is because the Synagogue was merely a temporary institution, while the Church was designed to endure for ever. The former was the shadow, and the latter was the substance. The former was "the schoolmaster to bring men to Christ," and the latter is herself the Spouse of Jesus, enjoying with Him the most close, intimate, and indissoluble union, so that there is really no further analogy or resemblance between the external polity of the Mosaic dispensation, and the Christian Church, than such as must always exist between a faint and inadequate type, and the person or thing obscurely indicated and shadowed forth. But if we would discover the full and adequate "Exemplar" of the Church—the image to which it perfectly corresponds—the form after which it is constituted,—

we must lift up our minds to contemplate the Incarnation of the Son of God. Between the Christian Church and its Incarnate Saviour, there does, indeed, exist a very wonderful and a very full analogy. To use the words of one who has thought deeply upon these interesting questions,*—the ultimate reason of the Visibility of the Church is to be found in the Incarnation of Christ. Had the Son of the Most High descended into the heart of man without assuming the form of a Servant, without taking human nature into His Divine Person, He would then have founded a church invisible and altogether interior. But because He was made flesh, and manifested Himself in an exterior and human fashion, He Himself as man living, teaching, and dying among men and for men, He has thus shown that the Divine Wisdom has chosen to make use of outward and visible means for the restoration and reparation of the world; and by this choice He has likewise shown that such outward and sensible means are those which are best adapted to the wants as well as to the capacities of our weak nature. Hence, as Christ began the work of human regeneration by His own Personal Presence upon earth in His visible human nature, so He continues this same mighty and momentous work through the instrumentality of a Visible Church, which is consequently the correlative of His incarnation,—a mystical, permanent incarnation of an already incarnate Saviour. In a word, it is Jesus Christ Himself, who constituting Himself the life, the soul, the Head of His members, in and through one body, is carrying on the salvation of mankind by means and instruments which the very attributes of His own Divinity render necessarily and intrinsically indefectible and infallible. This is alike the doctrine of Scripture and of the Fathers. In Scripture we find the faithful called “the Body of Christ,”—“the Church which is His Body, the fulness of Him who is filled all in all,”†—“the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ”—“one body,” of whom Christ is “the Head, from whom the whole body maketh increase into the building up of itself in charity.” Nothing can be stronger, or more entirely to the point, than the language used by St. Paul in his First

* Möhler Symbolism, p. 2, chap. v.

† Ephesians, i. 22, 23; ii. 16, 21; iv. 4, 16.

Epistle to the Corinthians ; "For," he says, "as the body is one and hath many members ; and all the members of the body being many yet are one body, *so also is Christ.*"* That is, so also Christ is one body. In the same way as the many limbs and divisions of the human frame make up together one and only one body, so Christ is many, and yet only one.† But how? He proceeds to give us the reason. "For in one spirit were we all baptized into one body, and in one spirit we have all been made to drink. Now you are the body of Christ, and members of members." Hence, if we would employ scriptural language in order to apprehend the real nature of the Visible Church, we would speak of it and describe it not only as the body of Christ but as *Christ Himself*, "*so also is Christ.*" The Church is Christ, continuing His Incarnate Presence through His Mystical Body. The Church is Christ, and because it is Christ it cannot err, nor fail, nor cease to be dear to God, and to be faithful to God. In a word, the powers and prerogatives of the Church have their real foundation in that union of the Head with its members, which, according to the sublime language of St. Paul, constitutes or makes up the body of Christ, and Christ Himself. So thought and so spoke St. Augustine, perhaps the greatest mind and intellect that has ever served in the cause of the Catholic Church, next to St. Paul and to St. Chrysostom. Those of our readers who may happen to remember the sermons of Augustine on the Psalms and on St. John, or his treatises against the Donatists, will recollect how repeatedly he speaks of the members with their divine head as constituting altogether one whole Christ—*totus Christus*. The Church in his idea is invested with a certain living personality. The members without the Head are nothing, and the Head is never disjoined from the members ; both together make up one living and energising body, and this body is *totus Christus*. Hence he

* 1 Cor. xii. 12, 27.

† Audi Apostolum hoc ipsum evidentius exprementem, sicut enim corpus unum est, et membra habet multa, omnia autem membra corporis cum sint multa, unum est corpus, sic et Christus. Loquens de membris Christi, hoc est de fidelibus, non ait, sic et membra Christi, sed totum hoc quod dixit Christum appellavit.—S. Aug. in Ps. 30. En. 2.

sometimes calls upon his audience to rejoice and give thanks to God, not only because they were made Christians, but because they were made Christ. "Br thren," he says, "understand ye the grace of God our Head? Be filled with admiration, rejoice, we are made *Christ*. For if He is the Head and we are the members, He and we make up the whole Man."*

This profound conception of the Catholic Church will be found to pervade the treatise of Professor Passaglia,† and we have endeavoured to set it before our readers as clearly and as briefly as we could, since it is necessary to the object which we have at present in view. For let this sublime idea of the Christian society be once fully and adequately apprehended, and it will be easy to follow the very remarkable parallels which exist between our Saviour as He appeared upon earth, and the characteristics and fortunes of the Catholic Church. We would ask our readers' patience and attention while we attempt to draw out some of these parallels. They will be found to have a solid foundation in fact. They are in themselves calculated to deepen our sense of the supernatural character and divine attributes of that great society to which the Providence of God has affiliated us; while they will not, we trust, be wholly without influence upon the minds of those who are beyond its pale. For the parallels themselves are such as in all fairness and consistency can only be applied to the Church which is in communion with Rome; and consequently the conclusion is inevitable, that it is this

* S. Aug. in Joan. cap. 5. Tract 21. St. Augustine goes on to say, Plenitudo ergo Christi, caput et membra. Quid est caput et membra? Christus et ecclesia. Arrogaremus enim nobis hoc superbè, nisi ipse dignaretur hoc promittere, qui per Apostolum eundem dicit, vos autem estis Corpus Christi et membra..... The following is too beautiful to be omitted. Noluit se separare, sed dignatus est adglutinari. Longe a nobis erat, et multum longe; quid tam longe quam conditum et conditor? quid tam longe quam Deus et homo? quid tam longe, quam justitia et iniquitas? quid tam longe, quam æternitas et mortalitas? Ecce quam longe erat Verbum in principio Deus apud Deum, per quem facta sunt omnia. Quomodo ergo factus est prope, ut esset quod nos, et nos in illo? Verbum caro factum est et habitavit si illo.

† See cap. 5, 39, 43, &c.

communion alone which can substantiate its claim to be the Catholic Church.

We must ask our readers to lay aside for the moment their Christian feelings, habits, and prepossessions, to become in imagination Israelites of the olden time, and to sojourn with us for a season now in Bethlehem, now in Nazareth, and finally in Jerusalem. We will suppose ourselves to have obtained admission into the house of a certain respectable inhabitant of Nazareth, and having been invited to take our place along with the other guests around his table, we will sit with breathless attention, listening to an unusually interesting narrative of matters affecting Jesus Christ and His parents, and which happened to come under the especial notice of our imaginary host. "My family and myself," commences our host, "chanced to be among the number of those whom the decree of Cæsar Augustus brought to the same inn with Joseph and Mary, but being in more prosperous circumstances than they, we were of course enabled to secure better and more convenient accommodation. I well remember the night on which the child Jesus was born. It was a cold December night. The stars were shining brightly in the heavens; the moon had begun to wane. The winter had set in with unusual severity, and the continued going to and fro of newly-arrived travellers, caused an amount of discomfort and inconvenience, such as we had rarely experienced. As if to make the confusion still greater, and to add another element to the universal disorder, a poor woman was confined in the stable of the inn. The report spread quickly enough through the house; but what from the necessity of looking after one's luggage, the claims of hunger, which after a long tedious journey loudly demanded satisfaction, and from the fact that the woman was supposed to be a person of no consequence, inasmuch as she was poor, and was lodged in an outhouse of the inn, the event scarcely created a momentary sensation; it called forth perhaps a smile, an expression of pity, an angry grumble, a hasty imprecation, and then no more was thought about it, each man being sufficiently absorbed in taking care of his own wants and interests. Some shepherds, it is true, came in at midnight to visit these poor people, but they attracted no observation, as we naturally inferred that they were relatives who had come to look after her wants. Early on the following

morning, as myself and others passed through the shed to give provender to our beasts of burden, our eyes rested for a moment upon the woman and her child. The little infant was a fine boy. It was impossible to mistake the strong and healthy colour of his ruddy cheeks; but one could not help feeling surprise at the hard lot which had condemned a young person, so tender, so modest, so gentle, so highly-bred, and, as far as we could see, so exquisitely beautiful as its mother, to give birth to her first-born son in a place only fit for horses and cattle.

"The scene changes, and we are established in business at Nazareth. Some years have passed since the enrolment at Bethlehem, and the occurrences of that eventful night had nearly escaped our recollection. To our surprise the same family re-appear at Nazareth. There is the old man and the young wife, and their little boy. We could not be mistaken about their identity. That mother had no compeer among the daughters of Israel, and there was a simplicity and a beauty about that Child which reflected the unearthly loveliness of its youthful parent. The old man opened a carpenter's shop, in the business of which he was frequently assisted by his son. Those three lived in perfect seclusion and retirement. Although kind and courteous to all around them, they sought no acquaintances, and courted no observation. Yet we had frequent opportunities of meeting with them, sometimes being led by business to the workshop of Joseph, and sometimes passing them by, as in the evening they sat before the door of their humble cottage, taking their homely repast. Yet they always seemed to be the same quiet, unobtrusive, harmless people, apparently wrapped up in each other's conversation.

"As time went on, from different causes we lost sight of this singular family; until one day upon entering with some of my children a synagogue in Nazareth, who should stand up to preach to the people, and teach, but the child of the beautiful Jewish matron, now grown into a man, and bearing upon his noble brow the unmistakeable lineaments of his mother's features. As all our family belonged to the strictest sect of the Pharisees, we confess to have been scandalized at this exhibition. Who was this that thus presumed to teach and preach? Why we remember Him a little boy working in his father's shop, and now He comes forward in a new

character, and is evidently aiming at overturning the traditions of our Fathers. Whence hath this Man this wisdom and these miracles? Is He not the carpenter's Son? Is not His Mother Mary, and are not His brothers, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And His sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this Man all these things? And they were scandalized in His regard.* Yet He continued to teach though men were scandalized by His doing so. His teaching, moreover, sounded strange and novel, and we knew not whither it tended. But there was no mistaking His voice nor His words; the report of Him and His fame spread abroad throughout the whole region; and wherever He appeared in public, crowds of the common people eagerly and enthusiastically gathered around Him."

This actual earthly life of our Blessed Saviour, which we have endeavoured to portray in some such manner as it must have presented itself to the eyes of those who lived at the same time, and in the same city, is called by theologians, His *human or sensible visibility*.† He was in all respects a man, like unto ourselves. He passed through the different stages of human life, infancy, childhood, and manhood. He ate, drank, slept, worked, conversed, was instructed, and taught. The practical men of that day, if they were men of good natural dispositions, may have admired His singular and heavenly beauty; while they may also have been attracted to Him by the modest loveliness of His holy character. But there was no outward mark or sign about Him, which compelled men to see that this Man was also God;—that He who had lain in the womb, had been an infant, a child, and a young man, was the very same whose goings forth have been from all eternity. On the contrary, to the merely practical man, the idea would have seemed preposterous; just as it seems now-a-days preposterous to the Socinian, and (although they do not, perhaps, admit it even to themselves) to the greater portion of the Protestant world. The thought either would never have crossed the minds of such men, or if it did, it would be instantly banished as absurd. The more forward

* Matthew xiii. 54, 55.

† Passaglia, cap. 5.

‡ Luke ii. 46.

among them laughed at the very notion, whenever our Lord Himself said anything that could be brought to bear upon it. "Thou art not yet forty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham?" It was something, they thought, worse than an infatuation to ask them to believe contrary to the evidence of their senses, that one whose days were passed in the midst of them, the years of whose short life they could so easily count up, had nevertheless been before Abraham was. But although they were obliged to reject with scorn this supernatural idea of Christ, they admitted, and indeed their rejection of the supernatural was founded upon this admission—the reality of His human and sensible visibility. "The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us." And the ordinary mass of those who were brought in contact with Him, saw and confessed the humanity in which He was enshrined, and saw and confessed this alone.

It has never been God's way in His dealings with free creatures to force sublime truths upon their conviction by a sort of iron mechanism. "The just shall live by faith;" and men are led on to the faith by the grace which excites them to reflect upon, to weigh and to ponder all those circumstances and all those matters that have in reality the strongest demands upon their most serious consideration. Thus, when our Saviour walked upon the earth, He did not overwhelm any one with His heavenly glory; yet He so manifested His Divine Nature, that the apostle could say with truth, "We saw His glory, the glory of the Only Begotten of the Father."* The human nature of our Saviour was the channel through which His Divine Nature was also made visible unto men; but it was not made evident to every kind and sort of person—to the sceptic, the impure, the careless, the man of money, or the hard man of the world. It was made visible to those who took the trouble to watch, to observe, and to think seriously. To such persons it became as evident as the light of the sun, that "God was manifested in the flesh." "We have believed"—are the words of St. Peter,— "and have known that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." "This more recondite visibility, which in contradistinction to the sensible and human, is called by theologians the intellec-

* John i. 14.

tual and divine, was manifested in a great variety of ways.* It was made evident by the notes of prophecy which met in Jesus, and pointed Him out as the Christ, the Saviour of the world. It was made evident by the angelic voice which declared to Mary, that the Holy One who should be born of her was the Son of God. It was made evident by the angelic song, which declared to the shepherds, as representing the human family, that "unto you is born a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." It was manifested by the Voice of the Almighty Father Himself, who twice during Our Lord's Life on earth, proclaimed from heaven, that "this is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." It was moreover manifested by those signs and wonders—those miracles of love and mercy, to which Christ Himself so constantly appealed as being in themselves most conclusive evidences of His Divine Nature and His Divine Mission. It was also made evident by that wonderfully attractive teaching which drew to Him so many thousands of the people, which exercised upon them a fascination so remarkable and so powerful, as to cause them to sit for hours at His feet, forgetful of the cravings of appetite and heedless of the ordinary cares of life; which had such music in its very words as to soothe and tranquillise all who yielded themselves up to its holy influence; nay, which was even able to send back to their masters the rough soldiers who had been commissioned to take Jesus as He was teaching in the temple, with the confession, that they were not able to execute their commission, because "never man spake like this Man." Lastly, it was made evident by the daily life of our Saviour, which breathed in its every thought, word, and act, a holiness altogether divine—a holiness to which nothing could be added, and from which nothing could be taken.

In these and in other ways, the Divine, no less than the Human Nature of Our Blessed Saviour was made visible; but this visibility was intellectual, not sensible, revealing itself to those, and to those alone, who took pains to think, to watch, to reflect, and to correspond with the incitements and motions of the grace of God.

The outward organization of the Catholic Church is the parallel which it presents to the human or sensible visi-

* Passaglia, cap. 5, p. 124, 125.

bility of the Son of God. There is no sane person who would deny that there exists in the world a society or body corporate, known as the Catholic Church, or the Church of Rome. This Society numbers amongst its members a large majority of professing Christians. It is the most conspicuous, the most powerful, and the best organised religious body in existence. Before its rise mankind never saw anything similar to it; and although, during the course of its eventful career, many attempts have been made to rival, or to surpass it; no one can deny that all these attempts have been made in vain. It stands alone in the world, with respect to the unity of its government, the compactness of its organization, and the wonderful hold which it possesses over the hearts and consciences of its members. Its greatest enemies do not venture to call in question either its existence as a religious Society, or the compactness and unity which gives it such marvellous power and strength. In other words, they admit that visibility of the Church, which the theologians call human and sensible. But they limit their admission to the human and sensible only. As to the notion that behind that which is obvious and palpable to the senses, there is something super-human and divine—it is one which they could not bring themselves to entertain. The standard of what is called common sense is thought to be infallible; and there is a large body of men who fancy that they can unravel all the mystery of the Catholic Church by judging it according to what they suppose to be this standard. We do not now speak of those wild fanatics whose religious existence appears to be mainly sustained by the most bitter denunciations of the Church of Rome. We allude to greater men—to minds of a higher cast—to men like Ranke or Macaulay, whose hatred of the Catholic Church, its dogmas, its institutions, and its spirit, although as profoundly rooted as that of the most violent ultra-Protestant, is nevertheless founded upon too intellectual a basis, to allow them to deny both its real power, and its real grandeur. Men, like these, sometimes surprise us by their apparent candour and liberality. They resemble enemies, who conscious of their own superiority, can afford to treat their opponents with the utmost generosity, and are proud of doing so. Far from vilifying the Church, they will speak of it in terms almost approaching to admiration. Never, they will tell you, was there a polity so wonderful

as that of Rome. It is the most perfect system of spiritual government that the world has ever beheld. It is an edifice erected and put together with so much care and skill, that it would be impossible to alter the position of a single stone, without injuring the symmetry and harmony of the whole. Everything is in its place, is doing its proper work, is contributing to its appointed end. Silently and steadily this great society of the Roman Church is effecting its own objects; and from working out these objects neither fears nor promises can turn it aside for a moment. It is a system which shows no symptoms of decay. Great cities like London may grow old and pass away, but when they are no more the old man at the Vatican will still be ruling from his solitary throne the consciences of millions of his fellow creatures. They will also admit that notwithstanding the progress of intellect and knowledge, the Catholic Church has more universal sway over the minds of men, and is more cheerfully obeyed at the present day than, perhaps, at any former period in her history. Nor does it exercise this sway over the weak, the ignorant, and the superstitious only. It has attractions powerful enough to secure the allegiance of the mightiest intellects of the age. Where will you find a body of men, for example, more able, more subtle, more intellectual, more profoundly versed in knowledge of mankind, than the Jesuits, and yet every one knows that they are the flower and the strength of the Catholic Church. Nay, this is one of those marvellous facts in connection with the Church of Rome—its applicability to all classes and to all descriptions of men—to the poor, to the rich, to the superstitious, and to the subtlest understanding. Moreover, it has in this, as in many other respects, the advantage over Protestantism, that whenever the two systems have been brought into contact, the Catholic religion has always won the day. Yet while making such admissions as these, and forming for themselves so ideal and so romantic a portrait of the Church, the class of mind to which we have alluded have their own way of unravelling the apparent mystery. You would naturally anticipate that after having admitted so much they would be ready to concede more; but to your surprise, they suddenly draw off, and with a significant expression of countenance give you to understand that they have managed to get behind the scenes. They see clearly how it all is. It is quite a mistake to suppose anything

super-human, anything supernatural in the Catholic Church. It is simply a very sagacious constitution of human policy. By a judicious use of such stereotyped expressions as "ambitious pontiffs," "italian subtlety," "the tactics of Rome," "the dark designs of priestcraft," and "the love of power," they explain in a way most satisfactory to their own minds, as well as to the minds of the Protestant public in general, all that might otherwise be deemed mysterious, super-human, and divine in the Catholic religion—in the unity of its purpose, the grandeur of its claims, and the durability of its existence. Moreover, there is often just enough of truth in these theories to give them a degree of plausibility. The Catholic Church, as a matter of fact, *has* its human side, and is externally worked by human means, and by human instruments. It is a great kingdom; and like other kingdoms has its ordinary routine of official business. It has its courts of law, its embassies, its elections; and, as in these things, the human element necessarily occupies a prominent place, a certain colour of plausibility is thereby really given to the opinion which would regard the Church as a human polity, and nothing more. Common sense, or what is usually thought so, here comes in, and exercises its dominion over "practical men." They see the absurdity of connecting anything super-human with a system which in its outward organization follows all the details of a merely temporal kingdom; and they are not going to suffer themselves to be the victims of superstition or of priestcraft, "the tools of a crafty priesthood." They will not submit their judgments to the guidance of others; but exercising what they conceive to be the inherent birthright of men, they have formed their own opinion with respect to the Catholic Church—an opinion which leads them to admire the ability with which it has been framed, but to reject, as absurd, its claims to a supernatural character. Thus, just as the practical men in our Lord's day were not to be persuaded into the belief that the carpenter's Son, whom in His place they were ready to admire and esteem, was the Messiah, the Saviour of the world, the Son of God, and God Himself; so the practical men of our own day are ready enough to admit the wonderful unity, and the sagacious policy of the Catholic Church; but they are too wise and too knowing to be caught by what they stigmatise as its cunning pretensions to that which is more than human.

Yet, if there be ought that is divine upon the earth, it is the Catholic Church. It bears upon its outward visibility innumerable marks of that Divine Presence, which, from within, gives it life and vigour; and these marks are such as almost forcibly to arrest the attention of all who do not positively refuse to see before them. It must be a divine principle which can unite together in the same faith and the same discipline, so enormous a multitude of the human family as that which constitutes the Catholic Church, among whom are to be found every natural element of discord and division,—the jealousies of nations, the antipathies of race, and the prejudices of caste. That singleness of purpose, too, which is so conspicuous in the Roman Church, and which has gained for it, from its enemies, the praise or the blame of being the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, “unchangeable and unchanged,”—what is this but an attribute of Him, of whom the Holy Ghost saith the same thing? In all times, and under all circumstances, the Church of Rome has manifested this same singleness of purpose. It has been shown in the zeal and ardour with which her missionaries have always endeavoured to plant the Cross of Christ in the uttermost parts of the earth, to reclaim the barbarian, soften the Indian, baptize the abandoned Chinese infants,—forsaking all that is naturally dear to men, and cheerfully, yea, boldly risking life itself for the chance of saving a single soul. It is shown in the firmness with which she is ready at all times to defend and protect the dogmas of the faith. History cannot point to a single accredited instance, in which she ever tampered with the sacred deposit, either by permitting it to be denied with impunity, by consenting to regard it as an open question, by giving up one particle of any of her definitions, or by holding communion for a hour with those whom she had rejected and anathematized as heretical. Her deadliest foes will not accuse her of sacrificing to expediency her own statements of doctrine. There have been times in her history when she could have secured the favour of the world, gained an increase of temporal consequence, secured herself from persecution, and replenished her treasury with gold, had she consented to modify her dogmatic statements, and to allow Arian and Nestorian, Erastian and Jansenist, to call themselves her sons and children, and to continue within her communion. But she has never, during the long course

of nineteen centuries, swerved from the principle from which she at the beginning started. Her language to-day is the same as it was a thousand years ago. She proclaims herself now, as then, the only teacher come from God. She determines, freely and boldly, what men are bound to believe, and what to reject. She calls on the whole world to receive her as their spiritual guide and teacher, and she denounces all as heretics, as aliens to the kingdom of God, as men placed by her anathemas in the same category with "the heathen and publican,"* who deliberately repudiate her claims and reject her authority. In this awful sameness and singleness of purpose, we discern an infallible mark of the *theological*, or divine visibility of the Church.† A human institution would inevitably change with the vicissitudes of the times, with the variations of opinion, or with the different characters of the great minds that happened to be its rulers and directors. But the Roman Church changes neither in its object, its principles, nor its mode of action; although its supreme pastors succeed each other in too rapid a succession, although its prelates are seldom called to their high posts of government until they have passed the meridian of human life, and after having laboured for a short time, then pass on to their rest, and leave their posts to be occupied by others; although, in a word, all around, and all within the Church, is ever undergoing a constant and incessant change and revolution,—the Church herself, nevertheless, remains calm, tranquil, and unmoved. The clouds may obscure for a moment the glory of her external appearance; the storms of persecution may now and then fiercely burst over her, and seem by their violence as though they would actually overwhelm and destroy her; but the clouds pass away—the storm is lulled—the thunder ceases to roar—the sun shines out again bright and gay, and Rome is seen to have recovered all her elasticity and all her strength. The world beholds with astonishment that she is not only *where* she was before, but with respect to identity and consistency, exactly *as* she was before. Surely this perpetual youth, this marvellous tenacity, this unconquerable perseverance of the Church, unparalleled as it is by anything similar in the world, can only be the fulfil-

* Matt. xviii. 17.

† Passaglia, cap. 5, p. 123.

ment of the promise, "*Super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferi non prevalebunt adversus eam,*" and they are consequently so many unmistakeable manifestations of its divine or theological visibility.

Most persons will admit that there is something peculiar in the religious character formed by the teaching and training of the Catholic Church. The Church of Rome is the only communion on earth in which Christian heroism, in its highest forms, is valued, honoured, and put in practice. The separated Churches of the East have their convents, monasteries, and religious brotherhoods; but, since their fatal separation from the centre of unity, they have produced no saints, and their religious life has subsided into a cold and stiff stagnation. It is otherwise with the Church of Rome. Not only are her associations for the cultivation of the higher departments of the ascetic life more numerous and more fruitful than those of the Oriental schismatical Churches, but as a general rule, they are full of zeal, of energy, and of vigour; they propagate the spirit of their founders through a numerous spiritual progeny; they keep before men the sublimest standards of Christian heroism, and they teach them that such standards ought not to be beyond their aim, and are not necessarily beyond their reach. It is, indeed, in the heroes of the Catholic Church that we can trace the most remarkable manifestations of its divine origin and divine spirit. It is only under the gentle nurture of Rome, that such men as Francis of Assissi, Ignatius of Loyola, and St. Francis Xavier could have been formed. They are the genuine growth of the Catholic Church, born in her communion, educated in her doctrines, penetrated with her spirit, devoted to her cause; and yet they are a trio which, in a pre-eminent degree, reflect upon the world, and reproduce in it the tenderness, the gentleness, the spirit of charity, the love of suffering, the poverty, the humility, the wisdom, the discernment, the elevation of soul, and the zeal and the self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ. If the Catholic Church could indicate no other symptoms of its interior divinity, the fact of having produced and trained these great saints, would be more than sufficient to establish her supernatural character. These saints have had their compeers within the Church, while among the members of their own orders they have had many who, with more or less completeness, have approached their own

degree of Christian perfection ; but beyond the Roman Church there are none who can be put into comparison with them. No sect separated from Rome has any saints. The counsels of evangelical perfection are professed, and to some extent practised, in the great communions of the East ; but these communions are like the branches of a tree which lie lifeless on the ground, in consequence of their abscission from the main trunk. Among the Protestant bodies there are neither counsels of perfection, nor any encouragement to practise them. Whatever attempts have been made among them to rise superior to the ordinary standard of the day, have invariably terminated in a melancholy failure. Wesley and Whitfield might have been something, had their lot been cast in the Catholic Communion ; but as it was, they were like delicate plants upon a desolate moor, which the cold east wind destroys ere they can bring their flowers into bloom. In the Anglican Church the highest type of sanctity represents the practical virtues of a quiet, social, married life ; a life in which the family affections occupy the most prominent place, where moderation and good breeding regulate the use to be made of the world and its wealth, where the love of God will never break out into any strong acts of zeal or of enthusiasm, and where there is little fear of meeting with any violent defence of doctrine or principle. This sort of life has, it is true, its good and its pleasing side. The refined and quiet religious demeanour of an Anglican gentleman, or clergyman, educated at Eton or Oxford, moral in his conduct, beneficent to the poor, a kind husband, an affectionate father, and a good neighbour, presents us with a most favourable and attractive type of the civilized man ; but it hardly comes up to the formal idea of Christianity, while, if contrasted with the standard set before the world, we do not say by such men as St. Francis Xavier, and St. Ignatius of Loyola, but by the Catholic priesthood in general, it is impossible not to be struck with the incongruity of the contrast. The former speaks of the earth, of the world, of the present life ; it keeps within considerable restraint, and at a considerable distance, all supernatural thoughts and aspirations ; but the latter resembles the breaking in upon men of the unseen world. It is, if one may so call it, the visible Incarnation of the grace of God ; it is Christ, continuing His own life in the Persons of His Saints ; it is,

consequently, a most infallible manifestation and proof of the interior divinity of the Catholic Church.

Were we engaged upon a formal treatise in theology, it might be well to enter more fully into those notes of the Church which foreshadow its supernatural and divine nature. But what has been said already is abundantly sufficient to show the reality of the parallel that exists between the twofold visibility of the Incarnate Son of God on the one hand, and the human and theological visibility of the Church on the other. As in the case of Christ, so it is in the case of the Church. The Divine Nature and Personality of Christ was made manifest through the instrumentality of His Human Nature, and yet it was not so made manifest as to compel the assent and belief of those who chose to disbelieve. There were men in our Lord's time who resisted all the accumulated evidence of His miracles, His teaching, and His Life; and because they thought that "no good thing could come out of Nazareth," refused to receive Him as their Saviour and their God. In like manner, the manifestation of the Divine origin, character, and attributes of the Church is as clear indeed and as evident as any reasonable being can require. Yet it does not force people to see it or to accept it against their will. In order to be seen and appreciated, it requires a certain amount of good faith, earnestness, fairness of mind, thoughtfulness, and attention; where these are wanting, it remains concealed and unknown. Men may, if they please, see in the Church only that which is human, political, and earthly. They may dress up some wild phantom of their own imaginations, in the tawdry colours of idolatry and superstition, and call this the Catholic religion; or they may resist all the accumulated evidence in favour of the Divinity of the Church derivable from its notes of unity, sanctity, and the rest, refusing to believe in her claims and in her spiritual existence, because, forsooth, they have discovered some imaginary defect in her practice, or because they cannot believe that any good thing could come out of Nazareth. Still their unbelief, or their hardness of heart cannot alter the nature of things. The Church is the same, though their intellects be so darkened that they cannot discern the signs of the Divine Presence within her. That Presence is there, notwithstanding their unbelief; and daily and hourly it is putting forth a thousand proofs of its Power and Reality.

Alas ! it is not the Israelites only in whom the prophecy of Isaias is fulfilled which saith—by hearing you shall hear and shall not understand, and seeing you shall see and shall not perceive.

The analogy which exists between the divine and human visibility of Christ and the Church, as it appears in the world, is carried on into the heresies which have successively attacked the Son of God and the society of which He is the founder. It is rather difficult, indeed, to gather from Protestant theology any definite and consistent view of the nature of the Christian Church, yet so far as the Protestant opinions can be ascertained and classified, they may be stated as the following:—(1) The true Church is a society wholly invisible. In the secrets of God's predestination is hidden the number of His Elect. What appears in the world has but the outward semblance of a Church ! the real and true Church of the promises—the Church which can never fail, and with which Christ is ever united, is seen by God only, not by man. (2) According to another theory, the Christian Church is a mere human institution ; there is nothing in it that is any ways miraculous, supernatural, or divine ; its highest aim is to fit the natural man for the proper exercise of his rational, intellectual, and moral powers ; and to suppose that there is anything in its scope which is beyond the reach or the limits of reason is to fall into a miserable superstition. (3) A third class of Protestants admit, indeed, that the Church is outwardly human and is inwardly divine, that is, it is inwardly supported by the grace of God and by union with God. But this union with God, this interior life of grace, is only accidentally combined with the human visibility of the Church. Sometimes it is found united with it, sometimes it is separated from it. The union is not ontological, but hypothetical ; and there have been times when the divorce between the two has only been too evident ! Lastly, (4) there are those who, like the Donatists of old, have exaggerated the purity of the Church. It is even in its present condition upon earth, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. It consists only of the saints ; the pure, the holy, and the just, alone constitute the true Church of Jesus Christ.

Such, we believe, are the principal heresies which have attacked the nature and attributes of the Catholic Church ; and they are paralleled in a very remarkable way by the

errors which have been at different times taught and preached respecting the Incarnation and Divinity of Christ.* As you will find those who altogether deny the visibility of the Church, protesting that the Church of the promises is wholly spiritual and invisible, so at the very first outstart of Christianity there arose the sect of the Docetæ, who denied the reality of our Saviour's human nature, maintaining that His Body was a phantom, that it had the semblance and not the substance of a human body, and that He Himself was wholly invisible. On the other hand, there arose another band of heretics, called the Ebionites, who, like the Socinians and Rationalists, denied the divinity of Christ, asserting that He was a mere man, just as a large and influential section of Protestantism regards the Church as merely a human institution. These heresies had scarcely been exterminated when the great schisms of Nestorius and Eutyches afflicted the Christian world. Nestorius maintained that there existed only a moral union between the Divine and human natures in Christ, while Eutyches confounded both these natures into one. And thus their respective heresies are analogous or parallel, the former to the opinion which admits an accidental and temporary union of the spiritual and the sensible in the Church; the latter, to the theory of the Puritans and Donatists, which confounds the visible and the invisible in one false and unreal spiritualism.

These coincidences between the Incarnation and the Church are, to say the least, in the highest degree interesting. We cannot believe them to be merely fortuitous or accidental; and if they are not accidental, they illustrate the great truth which forms the main subject of the present article,—that the Catholic Church is in a certain true sense, to use the words of Moehler, a permanent incarnation of Christ, continuing and repeating His own Life and His own fortunes upon the earth.

In Mr. Oakeley's useful volume we find a lecture on "The Church the Heir to the Reproach of Christ," and it is in the identity of this reproach that we discern another parallel between our Saviour and His Spouse.

"The peculiarity," says Mr. Oakeley, "of the Catholic religion among all objects of human criticism is, that it is in each several

* Passaglia, cap. 5.

instance that which the objector happens most of all things to dislike. It is a giant bugbear which has the faculty of transforming itself into a thousand shapes as reflected on the retinas of a thousand different eyes. It has one side of odiousness to the statesman, another to the civil governor, another to the man of business, another to the family man, another to the profligate, another to the rigorist; some dislike one of its doctrines, some another, while some object to all alike. There is also a large class of persons who have no definite idea about the Catholic religion at all, but abhor it merely because it is popular. It must be wrong, they say, or it could not be so generally hated."—p. 234.

The very same was felt with respect to our Blessed Saviour while He was upon earth. He was objected to, and was found fault with, upon different and even upon conflicting grounds. And it is most remarkable that the charges that were so freely, and with so little scruple, alleged against Him, are not only identical with those that are brought against the Catholic religion, but they are likewise founded upon the same principle, they spring from the same tone of mind, and they manifest the same absence of a practical belief in the supernatural. Mr. Oakeley has collected in his lecture on this subject many of these charges, and we recommend our readers to peruse for themselves the entire discourse. They will find it in the highest degree interesting, written with an unusual felicity of expression, and suggestive of many useful and instructive thoughts. For ourselves, in noticing some of these charges, we must follow the bent of our own mind, and instead of trenching upon the line of thought adopted by Mr. Oakeley, we should rather desire to make our remarks a sort of supplement to his more able lecture, by dwelling upon those points in the history of Christ, which appear to ourselves to be most remarkable in their identity with the charges made against the Church.

It was not unusual with Christ to take frequent occasions during the course of His public ministry, to teach and to exercise His divine power of forgiving sins. When St. Mary Magdalene, for example, anointed His feet with the precious ointment, and wiped them with the hair of her head, He said of her to the objecting Pharisees, "Many sins are forgiven her because she hath loved much;" and to herself He said, "thy sins are forgiven

thee.”* Earlier in His ministry, “they brought to Him one sick of the palsy, lying in a bed. And Jesus, seeing their faith, said to the man sick of the palsy, Be of good heart, son, thy sins are forgiven thee.”† In both these cases, the Pharisees and those who had heard His words, were scandalised at His assumption of a divine authority. “And they that sat at meat with Him,” writes St. Luke, “began to say within themselves, Who is this that forgiveth sins also?” In the other case we read that “behold some of the Scribes said within themselves, He blasphemeth:” or as it is recorded by St. Luke,† “the Scribes and the Pharisees began to think saying, Who is this who speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone? And Jesus seeing their thoughts, said, Why do you think evil in your hearts? Whether is easier to say, thy sins are forgiven thee, or to say, arise and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath *power on earth* to forgive sins.”

We have here an assumption on the part of our Saviour of the divine power of the forgiveness of sins. And in judging of this assumption, we must keep in the background our Christian convictions of His Divine Nature and Dignity. We must remember that He appeared among the Jews as “a Man come from God,” and that He was proving to them the truth of His mission by His miracles, His teaching, and His life. They regarded Him (and naturally enough before deeper conviction) merely as a man. By many He was regarded with suspicion. He claimed to be the Messiah, but there were several points in His history which excited doubts, apparently not unreasonable, as to the validity of His claim. He was born (it was commonly supposed) at Nazareth; and every body knew that no good thing had ever come out of Nazareth. He was the friend of publicans and sinners; He kept company with the lowest classes in the community; His own parent a carpenter; His associates fishermen; His followers a motley crowd of “the common people.” None of the Scribes or Pharisees believed in Him. The higher classes, with only a rare exception, kept aloof from Him; and the ministers of a religion

* Luke vii. 37-50.

† Matt. ix. 1-8.

‡ Luke v. 21.

acknowledged to be divine in its origin, almost to a man, rejected Him. All this suggested many misgivings and many difficulties to the cautious and respectable Jews of that day. Well then, as if to increase these difficulties, instead of trying to remove them by a charitable moderation and compromise of opinion, Christ comes forth before His perplexed and incredulous countrymen, and asserts His own absolute power of remitting sin. The Jewish mind was already in an attitude of incredulity, and it required very little to make this tendency to unbelief assume a definite and determined shape. Our Lord's own conduct soon decided their line. He forgave sin publicly and openly in His own Name, and by His own authority ; and at once Scribes and Pharisees, the highborn Israelite, and the devout worshippers in the Synagogue, were all equally and profoundly scandalised. The objection was evident. Here is a man just like ourselves, only we are not the companions of publicans and of fishermen, and His days are passed among them. Here is a young man, not more than thirty or thirty-one years of age, the Son of a carpenter, a Nazarite too of all people in the world, one whose family lives in the midst of us, and think of His presumption—why He claims power to forgive sins. Nay, we have heard Him with our own ears say to the sinner who poured the precious ointment on His feet, "thy sins be forgiven thee." Now no one but God can forgive sins, and yet here is a man who usurps this prerogative of the Most High. Surely if any thing were wanted to convince us of the falsehood of His claims, it would be such "blasphemy" as this. Thus, the exercise of this power to forgive sins, drove many a man farther back from Christianity: hundreds returned to their own houses filled with a righteous indignation, and firmly persuaded that they were pleasing God by rejecting Christ. We Christians know that this persuasion did not avail them before God. It did not justify them, nor render them guiltless of sin in turning a deaf ear to the Voice of Jesus Christ ; and it would be well if others would learn from their woful example to be afraid of a persuasion, however firm, which does not rest upon the foundation of the true faith.

If we now turn to the Catholic religion, we shall find that this very same difficulty, this same objection, occupies the foremost rank among the obstacles which have most influence in rendering the Church repugnant to the

intellectual and moral feelings of a protestant people. There is no one doctrine of the Faith which is so abhorrent to protestant feelings, as the Power of the Keys. The claim which the Church makes for herself, and for her priests, of power and of authority to forgive sins, is a claim which comes before the general protestant mind as an unparalleled instance of a blasphemy that is almost ridiculous. Every city missionary, every village controversialist, every Scripture reader, and every dissenting minister makes the "Romish doctrine" of the priestly absolution the staple of his feeble attacks upon the Church. It comes before them as a thing that condemns itself. It is simply absurd, since none except the ignorant and the superstitious could believe that *a man* can forgive sins. The objection against the doctrine of the Church is not only the same objection which was urged by the Scribes and Pharisees against our Saviour; it also comes from the same root. They do not ask the Church to show them how she came to receive this power and authority. They make no inquiry into the credentials of her mission as the Ambassador and Vicegerent of Christ. Nay, as a catholic, you press upon them these credentials, and you offer freely to set before them the charter of the Church's authority. You remind them of Christ's words by which this power was conferred; words than which plainer and simpler, and less susceptible of two meanings, have never been spoken. You point to the admitted exercise of this power by men like themselves, the Holy Apostles of the Church, but your argument falls upon them without effect. Their minds are pre-occupied with an antecedent prejudice which shuts the door against reason, evidence, argument, and conviction; and that antecedent prejudice consists in the axiom, that *a man cannot forgive sin*. "This man blasphemeth," said the Pharisees, for "who can forgive sin but God alone?" The Catholic Church blasphemeth, say the protestants, for "who can forgive sin but God alone?" The former forgot to observe and see whether Christ was not God as well as Man: the latter forget that the Son of God actually bestowed this prerogative upon men, saying to them, "whosoever sins ye remit they shall be remitted unto them;"—and again, "whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven." They forget that

this power was put into practice by both Peter and Paul—men in all respects like ourselves, except in their heroic sanctity. And they forget that to make man the agent and instrument for the distribution among men of the Divine blessings and graces, is in the most perfect and entire accordance with the analogy of the Christian religion in other respects, as well as with the ordinary working of the Providence of God. The reason of this forgetfulness in the Pharisee and in the Protestant is the same. It is an inward spirit of unbelief which induces them to receive as an undoubted axiom, and in a false sense, the proposition that man cannot forgive sin. The Catholic would qualify this proposition, and say, man cannot forgive sin unless he be God as well as man, or unless he be acting in God's name, as God's instrument, and by commission from God. The Pharisee and the Protestant refuse to entertain or to admit the qualifications necessary to make their respective opinions consistent with truth and the faith. They allow themselves to be carried away by an unfounded and an irrational persuasion of mind; and having imbibed the same intellectual error, they consequently make common cause, giving utterance to the same reproach—the one against Christ, the other against His Church.

Having touched upon this spirit of antecedent incredulity, we may as well complete our view of it by the aid of another instance in point. We refer to the discourse on the Eucharist related by St. John,* and to the effects produced over a large number of our Saviour's hearers by the doctrines He there lays down. In this discourse, our Lord laid down in clear and unmistakeable language the catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, and the effect of His words upon the greater proportion of His audience was, if we may so say, electrical. They had followed Him to Capharnaum, attracted partly by that instinctive fascination which so often drew men after Him, and partly by the less praiseworthy motive of desiring to benefit by another miracle which might satisfy their wants and appetites. Christ (however, had no sooner commenced this mysterious discourse, than a feeling of uneasiness evidently seized upon those who were listening to Him—not very unlike the

* John vi.

sensation produced in an ultra-protestant congregation, when a tractarian curate is broaching doctrines which they consider to be "popish" in their tendency. This feeling of uneasiness, instead of passing away, soon broke out into open murmuring. Our Saviour had said "I am the living bread, which came down from heaven," and this was the first point which directly scandalised and offended the Jews. "And they said, Is not this Jesus the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then, saith He, I came down from heaven?" They were willing to listen to Him, and to believe Him, so long as He kept within the limits of reason, and did not outrage their understandings nor the evidence of their senses, by such assertions as that the Son of Joseph had come down from heaven. But they forgot this cause of scandal and of offence in one which provoked them still more. After having said that He is the bread that cometh down from heaven, our Lord proceeded to propound in the plainest and most express terms the doctrine of transubstantiation. He told them that His Flesh was in very truth food, and His Blood in very truth drink; and He added, that unless they partook of that food—unless they ate His Flesh and drank His Blood, they could have no life in them. His audience were unable to tolerate any longer such statements of doctrine. They broke out into loud and angry murmurings, and the whole assembly evidently became disordered and confused. He offended by this discourse not strangers merely, but friends also; several of those who had hitherto been regarded as His disciples henceforward kept themselves aloof from Him. What could they do? When a man put forward as a divine truth a doctrine contrary to the evidence of their senses, and abhorrent to their natural feelings, could there be any doubt as to the line of conduct which they ought to pursue? It was surely high time to draw back, and to stifle at once whatever feelings of sympathy or of attraction had hitherto inclined them towards Him. "The Jews therefore *strove* among themselves, saying, How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" "Many, therefore, of His disciples hearing it said, This saying is hard, and who can hear it?" "After this many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him. Then Jesus said to the twelve, Will ye also go away? And

Simon Peter answered and said, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of Eternal Life.”*

How often has this scene been enacted over again between the Catholic Church on the one hand, and her fallen children and the unbelievers on the other.

“I have known of many,” says Mr. Oakeley, “who have rebelled against the teaching of the Catholic Church in the instance of this great doctrine, just as the Jews did, and as the disciples were inclined to do, against the doctrine of our Lord. Nay, the teaching of the Catholic Church has again and again had to sustain the prejudice excited by the very same misconception of it which so displeased the Jewish hearers of our Lord.”—p. 169.

And the ground of the objection is the same, namely, *its impossibility*. It requires you to believe what no one can believe. How can these things be? is the sceptical inquiry both of Jews and Protestants; and the attitude of antecedent unbelief which could not only suggest, but persist in repeating this question, was the secret cause why the Jews rejected Christ, as it is the reason why the Protestants rebel against the Church.

But perhaps the most obvious point of coincidence between the life of Christ and the fortunes of His holy Church is to be found in the political suspicion and jealousy which has been the lot of both in the world. Christ had scarcely appeared upon the earth, when He became the object of fear and hatred to the powers of the world. The infants at Bethlehem were martyred, because Herod was afraid lest “the King of the Jews” should live to drive him from his throne. During the course of His public ministry our Saviour upon several occasions hid Himself, lest the people should excite a political disturbance, and take Him by force to make Him a King. He omitted no opportunity of impressing upon His disciples, that “His kingdom is not of this world.” He willingly and at once consented to pay tribute to the temporal authority of the day; and when the Pharisees attempted to ensnare Him into a political error, He defeated their object, and confounded their motive by the wisdom of His reply—“render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.” Yet in spite of the unobtrusive quietness of His own life, in spite of His studied

* John vi. 67-70.

abstinence from everything that could give the least grounds for alarm to the temporal authority, this suspicion and calumny pursued Him even unto death. It was upon a political charge that He was condemned to be crucified. The superscription upon the cross was intended to convey the meaning that He was crucified because He had professed Himself to be the King of the Jews.

"Our Lord [says Mr. Oakeley] was represented to have 'stirred up the people,' as if such had been the object of His teaching, and not merely the unavoidable effect of preaching God's Truth in a bad world. He was charged with undermining Cæsar's authority, with which He never interfered but when it clashed with the rights of God. He was specifically accused of having discountenanced the payment of the lawful tribute or taxes, whereas He had, on the contrary, sanctioned and recommended it. But this will always be the fate of true doctrine and true Christian practice, when subjected to the judgment of indiscriminating people, who take broad and superficial views of things, and make no allowance for those faint and delicate lines which separate good and evil from one another."—p. 257.

The same suspicion, and the same jealousy has followed the Catholic Church in all lands, and under all circumstances, from the day of Pentecost until now. This suspicion and jealousy has not been restricted to those powers which have openly repudiated the authority of the Church; unfortunately it has at all times obtained a footing, more or less prominent, according to accidental circumstances, even among such as profess to be its servants and children. It was the real ground of the opposition with which Christianity had to contend in the early stages of its existence. It was opposed because it interfered with national customs,—because it would not tolerate any religion except itself,—because it would not sacrifice to the genius of the emperors,—because, in a word, it was new and "outlandish." It was a constant source of trouble and anxiety to the Church in her dealings with Catholic nations during the middle ages. It was the cause of the severe ordeal through which our holy religion had to pass during the last century in France, in Portugal, in Spain, and in Austria. It was a most efficient agent in promoting the Protestant Reformation throughout Europe, and to this day it exercises over the English people an influence which is almost wholly beyond the reach of reason and of argument.

There are two features which require special notice in the spirit which regards the Catholic Church with political jealousy. First, it is restricted to the Church in communion with Rome, and next, it is founded upon a principle, which, if true, and if acted upon, would have crushed and stifled Christianity in its very cradle.

First, it is restricted to the Church in Communion with Rome. In a certain sense we suppose it is true that the mere politician and statesman has a prejudice against all religions, especially when they assume a hierarchical form. But, it is the Roman Church only which at once puts him, as it were, into an attitude of defence. An unfailing instinct tells him which is the real enemy of the world, and which is, therefore, the real representative of Christ. Politicians are not afraid of the Greek Church, or of any embodiment of Protestant principles. The Oriental Communions are those which come nearest in their organization and in their spirit to the Catholic Church. They are dogmatic in their teaching, ancient in their origin, authoritative in their government, magnificent in their ritual. They are, however, stagnant Churches. They have all the "*membra disjecta*" of a Church, apostolical succession, a true priesthood, sacraments, monasteries, convents, and yet they fail to excite in the statesman, or in the popular Protestant mind, any feelings of real jealousy or alarm. They resemble a man who cannot move his limbs, because they have been paralysed, or they are like to a marble statue, lovely in the fair proportions of its inanimate beauty, and which almost breathes a life that, alas, it does not really possess. The instinct of the world is not slow in detecting that, although these great communions have all the external appearance of real Churches, yet, that in reality, the life and the sting has been taken out of them. The moment they fell away from union with the See of Peter, their power of doing the world any real harm was destroyed. They passed over to the enemy's camp by the very act of their schism; and when they chose emperors and princes to be their supreme Ecclesiastical rulers, they ceased to belong any longer to Him, of whom alone the prince of this world is afraid. It is the same with the Protestant religious communities. There are many who despise the Anglican and other Protestant bodies—none who fear them. While on the other hand there are many who fear Rome—none that

despise her. A remarkable instance in point may be adduced from the proceedings that took place during the memorable excitement caused by the latest "papal aggression." The Rulers of the Catholic Church made some changes in the internal administration of the Catholic Church in England, which had no more to do with anything political, than it had with the Emperor of China. Other religious bodies in England had, before this, made internal arrangements which were not very dissimilar in their way to those adopted by the Catholic Church. The Wesleyans, for example, "parcelled out" the country among their superintendents, and the Scottish Episcopal Church, a body hardly recognized by law, actually gave its bishops the titles of the ancient though defunct, Scottish Sees. Yet, so far were these religious bodies from exciting the jealousy of statesmen, and thus participating in the reproach of Christ, that the former was, and is free to do in England whatever it pleases, and the latter has been especially excluded from the pains and penalties that are directly and formally launched against the Church of Rome alone. We hardly know a stronger proof than this, in its way, of the reality of the spiritual claims of the Catholic Church. If it be wrong to "parcel out" the Queen's dominions into districts or dioceses, it is equally wrong when done by the Wesleyan or by the Catholic. And if it be an invasion of the Sovereign prerogative to assume titles from any of her towns or cities, the Scotch Episcopalian has been as much guilty of this political invasion as the English Catholic. But the instinct of the world assures us that, however true this may be in logic, practically there is a wide difference. The former is a poor isolated body, without strength or consistency, divided within itself, and which can well be left to the quiet enjoyment of empty titles. But the Catholic Religion is a living, powerful and energising Church. It has come into many a conflict with the world, and it may do so again. It has its own ends and objects in view. It has its ramifications all over the earth. It is compact and united under one Head. What can occasion no fear or alarm in a petty community like the Scottish Episcopalian Church may well be regarded as an aggression on the part of Rome. And hence, according to human policy, it is deemed just to repress the "ambition" of the one, though the act which manifests this ambition is nothing

more than what is constantly done in substance by the different Protestant communions in the land. Such has been the reasoning, and such the conclusions of statesmen, and of the political world in general. It is no part of our purpose at present to point out its fallacy or absurdity. We only bring it forward here in order to illustrate our own position, which is, that the Church of Rome alone bears the mark and the reproach of Christ, as in other respects, so also in the political antagonism which it alone excites in the world.

Mr. Oakeley has noticed this point in language more apposite than any which we could employ.

" Indeed, is not the universal and uniform unpopularity of the Catholic Church in every age of its history, and every place of its exhibition, a most remarkable evidence of its identity with the Gospel? Can you point to any single religion, except the Catholic, which has so consistently preserved this great note of Gospel truth? Is it not certain that all *popular* religious systems have a grand *prima facie* note against them; a fact to get over and explain away, when they try to make themselves out as the legitimate successors of that Gospel which was to be hated of all men for its Founder's sake? * That Gospel, as it was exhibited in the days of the Apostles, evidently corresponded with this description of its character; but what, I ask, has become of the 'reproach of the cross,' as time has proceeded, except under the banner of the Catholic Church? The Catholic Church, indeed, has varied in external prosperity. She has received, at times, a certain sort and measure of encouragement from the world, and this fact has partially disguised from public view the 'marks of the nails,' the tokens of her allegiance to a crucified Master, which she has incessantly carried about her. But look at her in her history; in her sustained protests against sin and ungodliness; in her tremendous conflicts with the Civil Power; in her inflexible demeanour towards heretics; in her 'unchanging and unchangeable' principles; in her Religious Orders; and, while you are reminded of the fact, you will recognize the cause of her interminable and internecine war with the world. Survey her in this country at the present moment. Here she is, eighteen hundred years old, yet with all the characteristics of her infant life apparent in her very exterior. What is the one religion in England which has been consistently hated by the world, ever since it received an independent position, and could be contemplated as an external fact? What is that religion of which, in the midst of our advanced civilization, the ministers are pointed at with

* St. Matt. xxiv. 9.

the finger of scorn in those very streets where the immoralities they denounce stalk about without protest? What body of men in this country is it whose motives, as a body, are habitually suspected, whose good faith questioned, whose name 'put out as evil?' 'Wonder not, brethren, if the world hate you.*' For even then Christians had begun to find the truth of their Lord's prediction, and to need the encouragement by which He accompanied it. 'If the world hate you, know ye that it hath hated Me before you. If you had been of the world, the world would love its own: but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember My word that I said to you: the servant is not greater than his master. If they have persecuted Me, they will also persecute you. If they have kept My word, they will keep yours also. But all these things they will do unto you for My name's sake, because they know not Him that sent Me.' †—p. 262-265.

But, again, this spirit of political jealousy is founded upon a principle which, if true, and if acted upon, would have crushed Christianity at its birth. We do not, indeed, suppose that any religiously-minded Protestant would admit to himself that he formally recognised the principle to which we allude; but many people almost unconsciously act upon principles, which if put into plain language, and nakedly brought before them, they would indignantly disown. The principle to which we refer to is this, that Christianity, or, to use an expression more familiar to Protestantism, the Gospel ought not to be propagated in any country without the license and sanction of the civil authority. It is scarcely necessary to observe that if this principle be once admitted, Christ, the Apostles, and the Church alike, become obnoxious to censure;—Christ, because He both preached Himself and sent His Apostles to preach without their sanction and authority; the Apostles, because they were constantly intruding into other men's dominions, and the Church in all ages, because she has consistently walked in the steps of her Founder and His disciples. It is upon this principle that the opposition to the introduction of the Hierarchy into England really rested. It is upon this principle that the Anglican Oath of Supremacy is founded, which, in the most general language, declares that no power whatever, spiritual or temporal, external to the country, has, or ought to have, any

* 1 St. John, iii. 13.

† Ib. xv. 18—21.

authority or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within it. This is certainly a sweeping proposition, and abstracting altogether from the question as to whether it states a fact, or what is manifestly not the fact, if we regard it theoretically and admit it to be true, we must acknowledge that it is as applicable to every other country in the world as to England. For all civil powers rest upon the same basis. They are the "Powers that be;" and the powers that be are ordained of God, and ought to be obeyed within their own sphere, for conscience sake. The temporal power in one country enjoys the same inherent rights as the temporal power in another. Those powers which existed ages and centuries back had the very same inherent prerogatives which now, by the same divine right, appertain to their modern successors. If, therefore, no spiritual power ought to have any pre-eminence or authority in the regions belonging to independent temporal sovereigns, the apostolic power at Jerusalem could not rightly or lawfully have extended itself beyond the holy City. At least, it ought first to have asked permission from the Roman Emperor, and since it pushed itself forward even into the remote corners of Britain, without either asking or obtaining that permission, it was guilty of an ambitious aggression upon the rights of the civil power to which you will find no parallel except in the proceedings of the Church of Rome. In fact, let the principle we have noticed be conceded, and all Christianity becomes an aggression upon the temporal authority. But if, on the other hand, you admit that the Apostles were not exceeding their own authority, nor intruding within the just domain of the civil power, when they went forth and preached the Gospel in all lands; you must give the Roman Church the privilege and the benefit of the same admission,—the cases are precisely parallel. For you cannot say that the fact of a country professing a certain form of Christianity, in any way alters the prerogatives of the true Church; since a false form of Christianity is as pernicious to the soul as no form at all. Nor did Christ make this exception and say, "My true Church and my true religion shall not be founded nor preached in any land where there may exist a schism from the Church, an erroneous, a corrupt, and a pseudo-Christianity. This would be evidently absurd, and therefore you must admit, either that what is called the aggressive spirit of

the Roman Church is the continuation and perpetual existence of that missionary spirit which, from Christ Himself, was communicated to the Apostles, and through them has animated the apostolic ministry of the Catholic Church; or you must maintain the monstrous principle we have noticed: and even then, you shew the wonderful and striking parallel that exists between the Roman Church, on the one hand, and Christ with His Apostles on the other, for, in virtue of this principle, you are compelled to condemn them all *equally*.

But the parallelism between Christ and His Church, or to speak more in accordance with the true Catholic conception of the Christian Society, the evidences of Christ still living in and through the Church, would be incomplete, if the harmony between the two was not borne out by their mutual correspondence with the spirit and the letter of the Scripture. Our Saviour has said of the books of the Old Testament, "they are they which testify of Me." In the New Testament, the Gospels are simply the records of His holy life and miracles, while the rest of the sacred volume bears constant witness to His teaching and His truth. There cannot, therefore, be any doubt that the Sacred Scriptures reflect, in every page, the mind and will of Christ. But do they likewise reflect the character of the Catholic Church? As Christ is clearly stamped in His holy image upon every page of the Sacred Volume, can the same be said with truth of the Catholic Church? If it could not, it would certainly shew a very grave defect in the argument we have hitherto pursued; and a defect too which we should be obliged to confess ourselves unable to get over. But we are very confident that the Image of the holy Church, like the Image of its Divine Head, is most clearly and lucidly reflected in the Sacred Scriptures. They testify of her as of Jesus Christ, and the testimony shews that Jesus and herself are One. Of course nothing is more universally impressed upon the protestant mind, than the opposition which they suppose to exist between the Church and the Bible. Catholics, they say, are afraid of the Bible, because it is against them, and the priests prohibit the reading of the Bible, because it would convince the people of the errors of "popery." But such foolish talking as this, however it may go down with the popular mind, has really no foundation to rest upon.

The more we study the Scriptures, the more are we amazed at its Catholic tone and spirit. The Scriptures not only contain the principal dogmas of our religion in so many plain words, words which protestants are forced to explain away; but still more, as Mr. Oakeley has well observed, they contain "that peculiar *idea* of religion on the whole, which the Catholic Church alone realizes and puts in practice." The different nominally Christian sects take isolated parts or texts of Scripture, bring them into an unnatural prominence, interpret them with a most uncritical rigorism, and throw into the shade all the rest of the inspired writings. There can be no doubt that the promise to St. Peter, or the words conveying the power of absolution to the Apostles, or the promise to the Church of continued miraculous powers, or the intimation of her infallibility, or the words of the institution of the Eucharist, are not merely difficulties, but thorns in the sides of all protestant communions. It is the Catholic Church alone which takes the Scripture as it is, without cutting away one portion of it, and explaining away the rest. It applies the same principles of criticism to the whole. It adopts without reserve, every one of its statements of doctrine in their literal sense; and it boldly declares that the Scriptures, like their Divine Author, testify to her office, her authority and her prerogatives.

We feel sure that no one will rise from a perusal of Mr. Oakeley's Lectures on this subject without feeling this same conviction. They touch on a great many points in which the Scriptures, in a most expressive manner, bear testimony to the *truths* of the Catholic Church. Take, for example, the Second Lecture on the Cross of Christ. After quoting several passages from St. Paul's Epistles, in which allusion is made to the Cross of Christ, amongst others, the remarkable words from Galatians, iii. 1, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you that you should not obey the truth, *before whose eyes* Jesus Christ has been set forth *crucified among you?*"—Mr. Oakeley proceeds to make what appears to us to be an exceedingly apposite and conclusive inference.

"Put yourselves," he says, "now in the position of a person approaching the study of the Bible, on the one hand, with education and intelligence enough to form a fair notion of its meaning; on the other, without bias in favour of any particular school of religious teaching, and follow me while I describe, *seriatim*, what

impressions such a reader would, as I think, be apt to receive from the passages just quoted. In the first place, he would not doubt that the verity expressed by the phrase, 'Cross of Christ,' must be one of the most primary importance in the religion of the Gospel. A second glance at the passages would further convince him that such verity must not merely be of supreme importance, but characteristic of the Gospel; its grand point of difference from Heathenism, Judaism, and Mahometanism on the one hand, and from all counterfeits of itself on the other. A further survey of the texts would lead him (would it not?) to pronounce that the Cross of Christ is more than even characteristic of the Gospel; in short, that it is a kind of epitome of it, an abbreviated mode of expressing all that is contained under the Gospel idea. And something more still, namely, that it is a highly figurative, expressive, and as we may say, pictorial mode of epitomizing the Gospel; in other words, that the Cross of Christ is the *symbol* of the Gospel, bearing to it the same kind of relation which a word bears to the idea it denotes, a picture or statue to its original, so that the bare recital of the term is calculated to inflame the imagination, and fill the mind of a Christian with all that is contained under the thoughts of his profession, that is, of course, as far as that thought admits of being analyzed, or the human mind is capable of grasping its import. This mode of teaching by figures, as every one knows, is very distinctive of the Sacred Scriptures. The discourses of our Blessed Lord furnish numerous instances of it, not merely when it is drawn out into the form of a parable or regular narrative, but where it is interwoven with the substance of general teaching. Such expressions as 'I am the Door;' 'I am the true Vine;' 'I am the good Shepherd;' 'I am the light of the World,' will at once occur to the mind in illustration. This method of teaching by images has great advantages over more prosaic modes of instruction, among which may be mentioned, that it saves a great amount of time, attaining the end in view far more expeditiously, as well as far more effectually, than laboured description, or oratorial paraphrase. The imagination is a most important ally where we desire to impress truth, or arouse to action, as is abundantly proved by the practice of the world. If a clever writer desires to express summarily on his title-page the subject of a work intended to compare Christianity with Mahometanism, he calls it 'The Cross and the Crescent,' and thus not merely embodies its leading idea, but embodies it in a striking and animated form."—p. 27-29.

After making some further remarks, Mr. Oakeley goes on to show how beautifully and how completely the Catholic religion, in its teaching and in its practice, corresponds with the way in which Scripture notices and dwells upon "the Cross."

"The sign of the Cross distinguishes our Churches in their exterior appearance, and continually meets the eye in their internal arrangements. Crosses surmount all our altars, and are worked upon our priestly vestments. Catholics form the Sign of the Cross upon their person each time they come into a Church, begin and end their meals, or enter upon any serious or important work, whether sacred or secular. With this sign does the priest, again and again, mark the infant or adult in the administration of holy baptism; with this does the bishop in the sacrament of confirmation fortify the youthful soldier of Christ about to enter upon his great and perilous campaign; with this does bishop or priest impart his benediction. Each act of blessing in the holy Mass is performed by means of the Sign of the Cross, and with the same memorial of the Passion of our Lord does the priest communicate the faithful in the Holy Eucharist. It is in the form of the Cross that he absolves the penitent, and anoints the sick. This blessed and most efficacious sign the Church instructs us to love with tenderest affection, and to treat with supremest honour, guarding as sacred as possible against any even unintentional disrespect towards it. No wonder, then, that the heretics have proposed the material cross as a test of the faith, and Catholics found in it an occasion of martyrdom.

"But the Catholic Church has many ways of 'preaching the Cross,' besides enjoining the customary use of its sign. First, there is the crucifix, which not only, like the bare cross, brings to mind the great mystery of redemption, but places its fact and circumstances prominently and constantly before the eye. What, again, is holy Mass, but the daily commemoration, representation, and application of the Sacrifice of the Cross of Christ?.... I wish you particularly to consider these facts of the Catholic Church as bearing upon the last of the Scripture passages which I quoted in order at the beginning. Jesus Christ, says St. Paul to the Galatians, has been set forth *before your eyes*. In the Protestant version it runs, '*evidently set forth*,' which makes the passage still more emphatic. And a Protestant commentator observes upon the expression, '*the word rendered*,' set forth, '*was used to denote things written on tablets and hung up to public view*.' Do you really think that *preaching*, however eloquent and impressive, can possibly satisfy the natural import of this most remarkable phrase? Nay, does not even a heathen poet supply you with the vindication of the Church's method of teaching the doctrine of the Cross, where he says, in praise of actual as compared with verbal representation,

" 'The ear doth slowly to the mind supply

Those truths which flash like lightning through the eye.' "—

p. 33-35.

"A remarkable instance of this correspondence between the teaching of the Bible and the Church, may be noticed

in the use of the word "heresy," and in the aspect of the Christian religion, which the word at once suggests to our minds, but which is manifestly at variance with the spirit and tone of all forms of Protestantism.

"They speak, over and over again, of the Christian Faith as something fixed, definite, and objective. I will quote, in order, the principal of the passages in which the character of doctrinal Christianity is thus described, and leave them in your hands without comment; and in the firm conviction, that, as candid enquirers, you can but take one view of them; namely, that they imply an authoritative disclosure, a fixed doctrine, a body of revealed truth; in other words, a Creed; and such a creed as rests, not upon the variable opinions of man, but upon the basis of an infallible authority. To the Ephesians St. Paul speaks of 'meeting in the unity of the faith;'^{*} and of 'one faith,' as no less the characteristic of Christians, than 'one Lord,' or 'one baptism.'[†] The Philippians he warns to labour together with one mind for '*the faith of the Gospel.*'[‡] To Timothy he speaks of a man 'denying the faith and being worse than an infidel.'[§] Again, of times in which men shall 'depart from the faith.'^{||} To the same, of 'erring from the faith.'[¶] To Titus, of '*the common faith.*'^{**} St. Jude exhorts Christians to 'contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.'^{††} Yet more frequent with the Apostles is the phrase, '*the truth,*' as expressive of the same thing. 'The truth of Christ;' the 'truth as it is in Jesus;' the 'truth of the Gospel;' or 'the way of the truth.' The 'truth' (by eminence), is set forth as the object of pursuit to those who have not attained it;^{‡‡} of obedience, gratitude, and zeal, to those who possess it,—and this in passages far too numerous to quote in full.^{§§} But one text there is, peculiarly important among the rest. St. Paul, writing to Timothy warns him how to comport himself in the house of God, meaning thereby, not the material building, but, as he goes on to explain himself, '*the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.*'^{|||}

* Eph. iv. 14, 15. † Eph. iv. 4. 6. ‡ Phil. i. 27.

§ 1 Tim. v. 8. || Ib. iv. 1. ¶ Ib. vi. 10, 21.

** Tit. i. 4. †† Jude, 3.

‡‡ 2 Cor. xi. 10.

§§ Ib. iii. 8; Gal. ii. 14; iv. 1; v. 7; Eph. iv. 15, 21; 2 Thess. ii. 10, 13; 1 Tim. ii. 4; iv. 3; vi. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 18, 25; iii. 7, 8; iv. 4; Tit. i. 14; Heb. x. 26; St. James, iii. 14; v. 19, 25; 2 Pet. ii. 2; 1 St. John, i. 6; ii. 21; 2 St. John, i. 35; 1 St. John, iii.

||| 1 Tim. iii. 15.

"The meaning of these phrases, 'the Faith,' or 'the Truth,' is still more clearly brought out by another word used in the New Testament to denote at once a disposition of mind, and a condition of character, opposite, respectively, to the temper which the Apostles inculcate in the passages just quoted, and to the position which they assume to be that of all good Christians. The word in question is Heresy. This, as you are probably aware, is a scriptural, as well as an ecclesiastical, term. It occurs both in its abstract and concrete forms, in several places of the New Testament. The Greek word from which it is derived, is, in your version, sometimes translated 'sect,' and sometimes 'heresy'; it is applied to the doctrine of the Pharisees* and Sadducees,† and to certain false systems of teaching, or corruptions of the Gospel.‡

"Now this same word 'heresy' embraces the whole of the present controversy, as one may say, in a nut-shell; and goes far, I may add, to settle it. I will go through its various significations, under the guidance of a Scripture lexicographer of great authority with Protestants, Professor Schleusner. 'Heresy,'§ he says, 'is a word which has no invidious meaning in itself, and signifies 'choice,' or option, between two alternatives.' 'The word,' he proceeds, 'in its next sense, means 'a sect, or body of persons who choose for themselves, embrace, and follow, the doctrine of some teacher, or some particular mode of life in preference to others;' and this, he adds, 'either in a good or a bad sense.' There are instances of choice within the limits of an established system, which we should express by the word 'school,' or 'party.' The sects of the Jewish Church were of this kind; or the 'parties' in the English Establishment. Where St. Paul refers to 'heresies' among the Corinthian Christians, he evidently alludes to parties of a dangerous tendency, yet still within the limits of the Faith; for he applies the term 'schisms' to the divisions occasioned by them.¶

"And now, thirdly, our lexicographer brings us to a far worse instance of the exercise of 'choice' in religion. 'There are also false prophets among you,' says St. Peter, 'even as there shall be among you lying teachers, who shall bring in sects [or heresies] of perdition.'¶ The original word for 'sects' is still the same *hæresis*. Thus does our lexicographer bring this word from its innocent meaning of 'choice, or option, between two alternatives,' to the sense in which it denotes a state of mind, or fact of religious position, which carries a condemnation in the very word used to denote

* Acts, v. 17; xv. 5.

† Acts, xxvi. 5.

‡ 1 Cor. xi. 19; Gal. v. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Tit. iii. 10.

§ *αἵρεσις*,

¶ 1 Cor. xi. 19.

¶ 2 St. Pet. ii. 1.

it. 'Heresy,' and 'heretic,' say what men will, are words of evil sound, which even I should be sorry to deal about at random; and which you, my non-Catholic hearers, would not like to be directed against yourselves. But what is this 'Heresy,' as we have traced the meaning of the term up from its etymology? It is the act of *exercising a choice* about our religion; or, in other words, the disposition of mind which induces persons to give scope to their liberty of judgment in matters beyond its province; or, the state of religious opinion which results from exercising such choice or using such liberty in an unlicensed way. And now, I will ask you, in what phrase, think you, would the writers of the New Testament have expressed the 'liberty of private judgment' in matters of faith? I think we must allow, beyond all question, that the word which would have come into their minds would have been the same ill-sounding, invidious term, Heresy. I confess, my hearers, painful as the inference may be to both of us, that if Protestantism be the religion of private judgment, 'heresy' must be its Scriptural denomination.

"Indeed, manifold as are the differences between the religion of the Bible, and that which, under whatever variety of external form the majority of our countrymen profess, there is, perhaps, no single point in which this diversity is more apparent than in the estimate of religious error. Not only is this Scriptural word, heresy, banished from the vocabulary of every religious body in this country, except the Catholic (unless, indeed, as a description of the Catholic religion itself), but any kind of severity against doctrinal error, of whatever magnitude, is popularly branded under the odious names of 'bigotry,' or 'intolerance.' The Scriptural and Roman Catholic term, heresy, is replaced, in modern phraseology, by a most inadequate substitute, 'dissent,'—a word which, it will be observed, implies that very right to differ from established doctrine, which heresy, in its proper meaning, condemns."—pp. 284-288.

Sufficient evidence has now been advanced to convince every thoughtful and candid mind, that not only are the prominent characteristics of the Catholic Church so many remarkable and complete parallels to similar characteristics in the life of our Saviour, but further, that the Church itself is, in very truth, Christ continuing His own existence upon the earth, and keeping up His daily personal intercourse with us by means of a perpetual mystic Incarnation. We are convinced that any idea or description of the Christian Church which falls short of this grand conception is inadequate or false; and it is among the many excellencies of Professor Passaglia's treatise, that it is entirely founded upon this idea. Let a man take in fully

the idea that the Church is, in Augustine's language, *totus Christus*, and he has the true key to the source of all its power and prerogatives. Unity, Infallibility, Perpetuity, Illumination, the Power of distributing Grace, Authority to remit and retain Sins,—all these are reserved to the Church by special promises, the words of which are not susceptible of any other definite signification. But they likewise belong to the Church in virtue of its very being. They appertain to the Church because it is the mystic incarnation of Christ. They belong to it, because, with Jesus Christ, it is *totus Christus*, and it is impossible that Christ could exist except as in the Unity of One Person, incapable of error, the fountain of Wisdom, and the Supreme Dispenser of Grace and Pardon. We should recommend our younger readers never to rest contented with establishing or defending the prerogatives of the Church by mere arguments derived solely from external sources. They must go deeper into the question. They must look upon the Church in her inherent nature and constitution. They must never be satisfied until they can grasp in all the fulness of its truth and grandeur, the conception of the Church as the *totus Christus* of Augustine; and when they have mastered this one profound idea, they have discovered the root, from which spring all its powers, gifts, and attributes; nay, they have also found the most complete confutation of all the heresies and errors that can possibly affect its nature and its prerogatives. Once admit this idea and it follows that there can be no branch Churches separated from the living Head, and from the other members of the same Body, for, as the Apostle says, "*is Christ divided?*" There can be no reformation of doctrine, for since Christ cannot err, His doctrine cannot become corrupt. The Church in one age cannot teach anything contrary to what it taught in another; for, since Christ cannot change, His truth also cannot vary. In a word, by the apprehension of this Catholic view of the Church, a standard and an elevation is attained which enables you to see the falsehood of many a plausible theory of Catholic unity, without ever descending to notice its peculiar arguments or pretensions. The reader, for example, will find that Professor Passaglia has treated the Puseyite theories of the Church in this way. Throughout the whole of his elaborate volumes these peculiar views have not once been alluded to. Yet, this silence does

not proceed from any ignorance of the opinions in question. No one in fact is more thoroughly familiar with all that can be urged by the Anglican party in their own favour, than Professor Passaglia, who has been frequently brought into contact with members of this party, both in England and at Rome; and many of whose warmest friends and most attached pupils were once unfortunately indoctrinated with those theories. But they are not noticed in his work, because the ground on which alone they could stand, has been completely cut away from under them. Principles are laid down and propositions are defended, which render it unnecessary to descend into the minutiae of a controversy so small, and in reality so utterly untenable. It is easy for those who are outside the Church to form for themselves some pleasant theory, which may appear to them to have many claims upon their acceptance; but to say the simple truth, without any wish to offend, such theories present themselves to the real Catholic mind very much in the light of the nursery tales by which children are amused and kept quiet. It is seldom, indeed, that those who are external to the Church, however well disposed, are able to take in the Catholic idea of the Church of Christ. The Church is a far grander, more noble, more divine Society, than ought that they have ever conceived. It is no puny institution, which had no sooner started into existence than it was split up into a thousand different divisions; and now broken, torn asunder, corrupted, and enfeebled, drags on a crippled and maimed existence. Nay, It is a Human-Divine Society in every way worthy of the Blessed Trinity, the Cause of its existence, and of Jesus Christ its life and its Spouse. It is the Mighty Witness in the world on the side of truth and justice, and against the powers of evil. It is the gracious and benignant teacher of mankind in all that can elevate the soul to God, and that can secure for it the noble destiny for which it was created. It is the Shrine, the Temple, the Tabernacle of the Holy Ghost, who is the gentle Spirit that animates, and the unerring Guide that directs it. It is "the Body of Christ," "the Spouse of Christ,"—it is Christ Himself, again made visible to men. It is the one object on earth which concentrates upon itself the infinite love, and care, and providence of Almighty God. It is a city set upon a hill, which cannot be hid; and yet it is wonderful that there should be those who

have no eyes to behold the heavenly beauty of its divine personality, and no ears to be charmed with the ineffable fascination of its calm, tranquil, holy, and sublime teaching. O wonderful that the city of God should be upon earth, and yet that men should regard it unmoved—that they should coolly criticise it, as if it were the common work of human hands, and that they should lack the greatness of soul which is able to appreciate its majesty and its beauty. "Coming to you from the very time of the Apostles, spreading out into all lands, triumphing over a thousand revolutions, so majestic, so imperturbable, so bold, so saintly, so sublime, so beautiful,—O ye sons of men, can ye doubt that She is the divine messenger for whom ye seek? O long sought after, tardily found, desire of the eyes, joy of the heart, the truth after many shadows, the fulness after many foretastes, the home after many storms, come to her, poor wanderers, for she it is, and she alone, who can unfold the meaning of your being, and the secret of your destiny—She alone can open to you the gate of heaven, and put you on your way."*

ART. IV.—*Report of the Committee of the Society for Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics. Read at the Seventh Annual Meeting, May 2, 1856. With a List of Subscribers, &c. London: Hatchards, 1856.*

THE word "*Souperism*" is now pretty well naturalized into the Irish controversial vocabulary, and, however grating to English ears, has undoubtedly some advantages over our own more courteous phraseology as applied to the subject which has given occasion to it. The term "*Souperism*" has this advantage over its English synonyme "*proselytism*," that it expresses, and that with a vividness characteristic of the land of its birth, the peculiar kind of spiritual aggression which it is meant to denote.

* Newman's Discourses to Mixed Congregations, p. 297.

Under the image of that grateful beverage which is so extensively employed by the zealots of reformation as a means of attacking the conscience through the medium of the hungry appetite, is described a certain class of temporal attractives which are sedulously employed by our modern evangelists for the purpose of introducing into the sister island the very singular form of Christianity to which they are addicted. Soup, while it expresses the principal of these inducements, also represents the whole class under a vigorous and striking metaphor. Were we to give an accurate enumeration of the other constituents of this class, we should have to ring the changes upon bread, butter, potatoes, pigs, fine clothes, and all else which is engaging to the heart of the Irishman, to say nothing of "places," varying in profit according to the value of the capture, from the humble rank of housemaid or errand-boy, to the more dignified elevation of school teacher or scriptura reader. Such is "Souperism;" and when we remember how proverbially and historically powerful the "mess of pottage" has always proved as a temptation to part with man's highest "birthright," we may fear that there is something which looks like fatality in the choice of this particular form of temptation as an equivalent to the blessings for which it is offered in exchange.*

The actual success which has attended the great proselytizing movement in Ireland, is one of those matters on which it has seemed almost impossible to arrive at even a portion of truth amid the jar of conflicting testimonies. It is not merely Catholics and Protestants who give us, as might seem natural, very different accounts of the effect of these attempts. Even Catholics themselves vary

* We were delighted to observe a very able and spirited article in the *Union* on the Report here under review, and beg to acknowledge our obligations to it. Not the least promising token in that article is the bold adoption of the word "Souperism" to express the detestable system which it exposes. This is one of the many evidences which the *Union* gives of a desire to throw itself heart and soul, into the spirit of Catholics. It forms an agreeable contrast to that eclectic, fastidious, and patronizing tone of compliment of which we are sometimes the objects, or rather victims, at the hands even of friendly critics.

materially from one another in their evidence on the subject ; some telling us that the efforts of proselytizing zeal have succeeded in making considerable inroads upon the faith of Ireland—others maintaining, with equal confidence, that the success of the movement is most absurdly exaggerated. There may be reason also to think that these several judgments have been, in some measure, unconsciously coloured by the natural bias of the witnesses, of whom one portion is disposed to measure facts by a strong antecedent prejudice in favour of the inflexibility of Irish faith ; another, to give ready credence to stories which fall in with previous impressions of Irish fickleness and venality. In the great uncertainty created by this war of testimonies, though with a strong personal inclination to believe (antecedently to irrefragable evidence) everything which is good of the Catholic poor of Ireland, we caught with avidity at a document bearing a statistical character, and emanating from the stronghold of "Souperism" itself. We were of course prepared to take *cum grano*, the testimony of the parties concerned in this movement, and especially as knowing that "cooking" is an accident as inseparable from "Reports" as from the soup whose successes they chronicle. Of a statement framed for the very purpose of eliciting the applause of a public meeting, satisfying subscribers, and inviting subscriptions, it would be quixotic to suppose that its natural tendency is to the *unfavourable* side. Who does not know how easy it is, and how necessary, (and that, too, without anything like dishonest falsification of facts) to set matters in an advantageous light, and to withdraw into the back-ground all which can check hope and cloud encouragement ? And, to do the present Report but justice, it must be admitted to possess this feature in common with other Reports ; it betrays a manifest, and yet not an exaggerated desire, of subserving the interests of the Society to which it belongs ; a natural and perfectly legitimate vein of promise and hope ; an inclination to gild the bitter pill and sweeten the nauseous draught ; to press topics of consolation, and mitigate the force of unwelcome disclosures. Yet, after every allowance of this kind, the most obtuse intellect cannot fail to perceive that the materials of congratulation are felt to be exceedingly scanty, and that a most praiseworthy reliance upon Providence everywhere takes the place of that solid substratum of hope which

would guarantee the grounds, though it might possibly diminish the merit, of this exalted and sometimes rather extravagant confidence. There is something (as we shall hope to show by quotations) almost touching in the strain of pensive melancholy which ever and anon discloses itself amid the tinkling of cymbals and the beating of drums; it reminds us of the wailing of the wind instruments at a military funeral; indeed the general tone of this very curious Report is that, far more of men accompanying a corpse with honour to the tomb, than of those who are heralding the glories of a victory.

The earliest note of discouragement meets us in the very first page.

"The ordinary, and what, in dependence upon God, may be called the reliable, income of the Society, has decreased in the past year in a measure which gives just grounds for the fear that it may become necessary seriously to diminish the efficacy of the Missionary operations."—p. 7.

The Report consists principally of returns made by the various agents of the Society, of the fruit of their labours in different districts. We shall proceed to notice some of the conclusions, interesting to the Catholic public, which are warranted by these records of Protestant missionary experience, verifying them as we proceed by quotations.

The first impression favoured by the Report is, that modern Protestantism has added an entirely new weapon of spiritual influence to those which it found ready made to its hand; we allude to the circulation of handbills and the posting of placards. The distribution of the Scriptures themselves appears to have yielded as a principal method of evangelizing the world to this new theory of the power of posters and the fruit of fly-leaves. The extent to which this peculiar form of controversial warfare is actually practised in Ireland will, as we anticipate, be a surprise to the uninitiated reader. But what is yet more remarkable than the immensity of the supply of this new kind of evangelical literature is, the extraordinary importance evidently attached to it by its promoters. Indeed, the statistics of this Missionary Society turn far more on the distribution of handbills than upon the diffusion of bibles, while actual conversions enter but most rarely into the items of the account.

The return, for instance, from King's and Queen's County states, that "The circulation of handbills and placards has been carried on very extensively throughout the whole district. Hundreds of respectable Roman Catholics receive handbills by post, and they are very rarely returned." (Query, are they worth the return postage?) "Numbers are scattered on the roads, and are seldom torn or defaced; and at the public fairs, thousands are willingly taken, and there is *much reason to believe* are attentively read. The number of handbills distributed during the year amounted to 28,175, and of placards 1100. Besides this, there were circulated 500 controversial tracts." The writer innocently observes, "Who can estimate the blessed effects which may result from so much seed being scattered over this part of the whitening fields of Ireland?" (p. 33.)

KILKENNY.—"*Although our number of converts is few, there is a wide-spread spirit of inquiry amongst the people which will one day, I trust, result in an important change. A vast number of placards (sic) have been posted during the year, and of handbills (sic) distributed; and though many of the former have been torn and defaced, yet crowds might be seen reading them; and numbers, particularly on market and fair days, have taken the handbills, read them, and*" (prepare yourself, gentle reader, for a most impressive announcement) "*read them, and—put them in their pockets.*" (p. 36.) Truly, waste paper has its domestic uses.

The Cork agent thus "sums up the work of the year." "There have been 35 controversial sermons; 83 other sermons and lectures delivered; 364 controversial meetings held, at which 25,730 persons attended; 12,336 families visited, or 30,697 persons; of these 2831 families and 7906 persons were *new*. At the schools there was a gross attendance of 453 children, and 107 on a daily average. There were 41 bibles, 39 testaments, and 103 portions, besides 3050 placards, and 178,150 handbills circulated." (p. 39.)

BANDON.—"The handbills continue to be as useful as at any former time. Even they who say it is wrong to be circulating such papers cannot resist reading them. *One of our agents stood within sight of a chapel on a Romish holy day lately, and saw several persons going towards the chapel, and kneeling outside the walls, and in that*

posture reading some handbills he had dropped. The subject of the handbills was the danger of worshipping the wafer." (p. 43.)

It must be confessed that the recorded effects of this extensive spiritual "touting," are exceedingly inadequate to the value attached to it. It is said that walls have ears; but, under the influence of these Protestant agencies, they may be said to have had tongues also. Kilkenny and Bandon must have been absolutely plastered with doctrine; one sees in imagination the killing capitals and the startling notes of admiration; yet both alike appear to have been wasted upon a stubborn generation. The testimonies we have cited will, as we think, not merely throw light upon this very novel method of preaching the Gospel, but will also justify what we have said upon the sanguine temperament of the missionaries themselves. Here are men who build their hopes of protestantizing Ireland upon such slender foundations as the distribution of handbills which they have no other evidence for supposing are even read, than that they do not come back by the post, are consigned to the pocket, or meet the eye of a humble Catholic because they strew the ground upon which he is kneeling! Some of these papers are confessedly "torn or defaced;" a few of them are read, but actual conversions resulting from them have no existence except in the fond imaginations of the distributors.

We come next to the general tone of this Report which is on the whole beyond all question, plaintive and desponding. The testimony of the various witnesses to the "extraordinary difficulties" which beset their work is strikingly consentient. They profess, and evidently take, the most exalted view of the extent of Catholic zeal, the power of Catholic union, and the consummate skill of Catholic spiritual tactics. We hope and believe that they are justified in attributing these qualities to the religion which confronts them. But there is one difficulty upon which they do not dilate, but which we suspect is their most formidable antagonist—the tenacity of Irish faith. When it is remembered how certainly the manufacturers of Reports will see all their prospects *en couleur de rose*, how tardily they will acknowledge failures, how unwillingly admit obstacles, how fondly exaggerate advantages, we think it will be admitted that their language in the present Report betokens a very deep sense of the arduousness, not to say

actual impracticability, of the work they have undertaken.

The Secretary at Athlone writes (the italics are ours.) "*On the whole*, on reviewing the past year we have great reason to bless God, &c.—and to pray that the operation (of the Society) may be continued in zeal and patience until He sends out His word, and blows with the wind, to melt the ice that binds up the heart of this people." (p. 14.)

The Celbridge Secretary writes:

"It is not for us to say what result *may* arise from so large a circulation of the Word of God," &c. (p. 15.)

"It must be recollected," writes the Secretary of the Ulster Committee, "that the experiment of aggressive controversy is quite new in Ulster, and that in such a community it has *peculiar difficulties* to encounter." (ib.)

The report from Cork, after describing the very effective state of the Catholic Church in that city, concludes in these apologetic words—

"Amid such opposition, and lack of adequate means (humanly speaking) to meet it, it is wonderful that *anything* (sic) has been accomplished, and *if it has* it can only be ascribed," &c. (p. 40.)

From Galway it is said,

"The main feature of progress *has not been so much in the numbers* who have openly declared their conviction of their errors, as in a gradual breaking down of superstition," &c. (p. 46.)

The same writer thus dilates upon the causes of this disappointment:

"While we are enabled with gratitude to our covenant God (this expression occurs more than once in this Report,).....to tell of many hopeful things in this Missionary district, *it would be vain to say that we do not meet with our disappointments and our immense difficulties, sometimes the greatest from quarters where we should least expect them. The deadness of the people to all enquiry after truth is depressing*—the powerful Romish influence, where there are about twenty-five Romanists to every Protestant, and many other things are great difficulties, but thanks," &c. (p. 48.)

The Tuam agent again insists upon the important fact that the effect of the Society's operations is not to be measured by *conversions*. After repeating, as usual, the number of placards and handbills, put into circulation, he "thanks God" (why, we do not quite see,

that the Society is not to measure its success by the absolute renunciation of Popery on the part of a few, but by the leavening of the population, &c. He then sums up his report as follows:

"In bringing the Gospel torch amidst the darkness of Romanism, *we have fearful odds to contend against. The whole Protestant population does not exceed at most 500*, while Rome has 23,900. She has ten priests, besides Sisters of Mercy and Christian Brothers, almost without number, who have schools in every quarter. Well may we exclaim, What, are we among so many! Nevertheless, let us take courage." (p. 50.)

The Lough Corrib agent writes in the same strain.

"*Upon the whole*, my impression of the past, and my hopes of the future *are not calculated to produce discouragement*. The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong." (p. 55.)

The Castlekerke agent writes—

"I can conscientiously say that, *though none have openly joined us* during the year, still I believe there are numbers who have imbibed much of the truth, and who are far more favourably impressed respecting us than they were twelve months ago." (p. 56.)

From Ballycourea we hear of "*discouragements and sad disappointments*." (p. 60.) From Moyrus of "*many disappointments*." (p. 61.) From Ballinakill, of "*trials and anxieties*." From Killery, of "*difficulties*." (p. 64.) From West Sligo, of "*manifold short comings*." (p. 73.) In fine, the Louth Missionary candidly acknowledges that the efforts of the Society up to that time "*had not produced those conspicuous and striking results which some are prone to hope for as the only evidence of Missionary success*," however, that he is still satisfied that "*a large amount of good had been done in this arduous and disheartening field of labour, and that God will, in His own time, give them the fruit of an abundant and prosperous harvest*." (p. 85.)

We think it will be generally admitted that these quotations attest rather the humility of the writers than the success of the work. It is indeed evident that, with every desire to make the best of a bad case, the Report of the Society for promoting missions among the Irish, has to chronicle annually a most miserable failure. It is indeed a sad reflection, that such really excellent persons, as

we know to be some of those whose names appear on the subscription list, should be deluded into spending their money upon so palpable a "sham." It appears by the balance sheet of the Society, that no less a sum than £40,000 is annually subscribed towards this speculation, unprofitable as it is unholy. All we can say is, that if in this Report, the contributors are able to recognize the fruit of their outlay, we rather, in the words of the ancient orator, "congratulate them upon their simplicity than emulate their wisdom."

In one point of view, the testimony of this Report ought to be peculiarly satisfactory to Catholics. It bears the most unequivocal witness to the zeal and vigilance of the priesthood. We hear with real satisfaction that at Dublin "the most determined efforts are made to lessen the numbers attending [proselytizing] schools." As an instance, we are told that a respectable-looking female (who turned out to be the priest's schoolmistress) was found intercepting the children, and endeavouring to take them away.

"No later than yesterday," it is added, "your missionary witnessed an effort of a similar description. Two men were stationed outside the door of the Townsend Street Sunday School, where they remained, until a priest, who acted to all appearance as their superintendent, came past, and then all three marched off together. Throughout the day they had been engaged in visiting the houses of such persons as usually attend that school, endeavouring to dissuade them from going to it."—p. 28.

The following picture is really most refreshing, and bears unquestionable marks of truth.

"Here," (says the Cork reporter,) "I may refer to the antagonist forces that we have to encounter. There are not here, as in many other districts, open violence and priestly denunciations. The streets are quiet, the alleys silent, the priests most bland. But deep, and dark, and deadly are the workings of the system; more dangerous, because more secret. The Society of St. Vincent de Paul collects annually an average sum of £2000, wisely distributed among the wavering members of the Church; the tread of the Sister of Charity steals through every lane, and her lips pour poison (!) into the ears of every convert in every hospital. A Roman Catholic Young Mens' Association supplies lectures, books, and teachers, for a nominal fee, and keeps in compact organization, and strictest union, all the upper and middling ranks of the Roman Catholic population. The confessional is worked incessantly, which accounts

for a sudden change often found by the readers in the feelings of families towards the Word of God, otherwise inexplicable. The press in the interest of Rome, conducted with surpassing ability, seizes upon every advantage, either to exalt its Church, or depreciate and damage the Established, and all its societies. The priests, though not turbulent, are neither unwary nor inactive; and the monks ply most industriously the work of education (secular); and it is reported with great success, by the Commissioners of Endowed Schools lately in Cork. There are National and Jesuit Schools in every quarter of the town; and a strong political combination of Romanists against everything bearing the name, or in the slightest degree favouring Protestantism. This reminds us of the inadequate machinery at our command, and the pressing wants of the Mission."—pp. 39, 40.

The Report contains other evidence of the same satisfactory character.

Of course we do not mean for a moment to imply that the whole of this Report is couched in the same desponding language. We have quoted these passages to prove what we think must be the impression of every reader that its general tone is far from encouraging, and this, notwithstanding all the temptations which present themselves in the construction of any such document, to the most favourable exhibition and the most sanguine interpretation of facts.

But a still better criterion of the small success which has attended the operations of the Society will be found in the actual statistics of conversion, which we shall accordingly proceed to collect and set before the reader. Yet even this evidence must not be taken without a certain qualification. The question still remains unanswered by anything in this Report, What are the recognized *tests* of a "Conversion?" We have strong reason for thinking that in the Protestant estimate they are extremely inadequate to the subject on which they are employed; in short, that many a so-called "conversion," which goes to swell the statistics of these proselytizing societies would be found, upon closer examination, to be some act or other which involves indeed a very grievous sin against faith, but which amounts at the worst to something far below positive apostasy. Some indeed of the criteria of missionary success given in the Report are insufficient to the extent of being simply ludicrous. We find the most confident hopes built upon such facts as that of a Catholic attending a controversial lecture or sermon, courteously receiving the visit of a mis-

sionary, accepting a bible, reading a handbill or placard, &c., &c. Sorry, indeed, are we to hear of Catholics giving any kind of countenance or quarter to persons who come to them as wolves in sheep's clothing, and against whom the apostle of charity himself, St. John the Evangelist, would have bidden them to close their doors, and withhold from them even the customary salutation of courtesy. But justice and truth alike demand of us to make a broad distinction between acts of this nature and that fatal and final sin which separates a Catholic from the blessings and the hopes of church-communion. Even such an act as that of attendance at the Protestant service, though a still more serious dereliction of duty in the same line, is of course no infallible token even of a wavering, still less of a shipwrecked faith. Many a poor Irish Catholic, goaded on to acts against conscience by the cravings of hunger, or, what to many would be a still more trying temptation, the cries of famishing children, is led to adopt some practice of outward conformity to an heretical sect, which is perfectly independent of any deliberate consent of the will to disbelief of his religion. Again, the Catholic Irish especially are disposed, both by nature and habit, to draw subtle distinctions between the character of different acts, very dangerous indeed to conscience, yet perhaps, in the judgment of charity, of a nature to exempt them from formal sin. The instance we are about to give is not meant as an illustration of the latter portion of this remark, but it bears intimately upon the former. An Irishman who had, alas, completed (at least for the time) his act of apostasy, by receiving the Protestant communion, was reproached by the priest, to whom he subsequently made recantation of his error, with the enormity of such a sin. "Sure," was the reply, "and it was a sin; but then I thought it could do me no harm, for I knew it was only bread and wine, and no Sacrament at all, at all." The peculiarly limited requirements of a Protestant "conversion" are greatly in our favour. No Catholic in his senses would think of calling that Protestant a "convert" who should be seen frequenting, even for years, a Catholic church, or be a diligent reader of Catholic controversial books. The reception of the Sacraments, of course, is the turning-point with us. But our antagonists set their standard of conversion far lower than this; and did *we* adopt *their* rule, what accounts might not

we give, in published reports or otherwise, of the progress of the Catholic religion during these latter years! These gentlemen sit so exceedingly loose to the duties of external religion, and are, on the other hand, so extremely ready to catch at nominal converts, that the poor Irish have rarely even any temptation (we speak always of *adults*) to complete their apostasy by a formal act of communication "*in sacris*;" for, in truth, among the religionists who interest themselves in that kind of work, there are few enough "*sacra*" in which to communicate.

Again, it is notorious to all who have experience of the Irish, that, while some of them are tempted by bribes dexterously applied under circumstances of great temptation, to commit grievous sins against the Faith during their lives, the number is extremely small of those who are not reconciled to the Church, even when they have formally apostatized from it, upon their deathbeds.

Taking therefore into account, 1, that many a "conversion" is in truth no conversion at all, and, 2, that even a true "conversion" is no pledge of a final separation from the Catholic Church; and making from the statistics of the Society the deductions necessarily involved in these qualifying considerations, we think that the facts which, in the Report under review, lie embedded deep in a mass of superincumbent self-gratulation, or self-depreciation, or self-complacency, or whatever other sentiment has "dear number one" for its ruling motive, or the object of its reflex operation, will not be felt very damaging to the cause of religion, at least as regards the diminution of its hold upon the great mass of the adult population of Ireland.

We have perused the Report with some care in order to get at the precise number of "converts" actually *claimed* as such. We may be quite certain that this number will not fall *below* the truth of the case. On the contrary, without imputing even exaggeration to the framers of the Report, (and we must in justice to them say that the Report gives no tokens of it), we may easily believe that, for the reasons just stated, some of these "converts" are but half converts, and a still larger proportion will not continue such. But let us come to the statistics of proselytism. The following is a tabular view of the conversions in the year ending May 1856.

Dublin	0	Erislannon	0
Monkstown	0	Errismore	0
King's and Queen's C	0	Balliconrea	0
Kilkenny	0	Moyrus	0
Cork	8	Ballinakill	0
Bandon	5	Killery	0
Fermoy	0	Ballieroy	0
Aughrim	0	West Sligo	1
Galway	0	Belfast	0
Tuam	5	Kingscourt	0
Headford	0	Loughmask	0
Spidal and Inverin	0	Achill	1
Killeen	0	Roscommon and Leitrim	1
Lough Corrib	0				
Castelkerke	0	Total conversions in 1856			21
Connemara	0				

Here are twenty-nine missions, some of them populous and extensive, yielding a return of but twenty-one even nominal converts in the course of a year. On the other side we have several confessions of loss. For instance, in Connemara.

"In estimating the effect of the works, we are forcibly reminded of the difficulty of judging by appearances. One, whom we for some time regarded as a convert, *sent for a priest the day before he died*; while another, a Roman Catholic tradesman, would have me attend him all through his illness, and *though he never separated from Rome, and even allowed the priest to come to him*, yet he declared that he had no confidence in any but Jesus alone."—p. 58.

The latter anecdote reminds us forcibly of the triumph exhibited at the Evangelical Tea-party in "Loss and Gain," on the fact of Pope Gregory XVI. having died "a true believer," because he was known to have expressed confidence in the merits of his Redeemer.

Again:—"Seven have returned to Popery, of whom three were young women who married Popish husbands, who most probably influenced them. Two others were the son and daughter of Romish parents who had not the moral courage to resist the priest's repeated denunciations, and another was a man who was never regarded as a decided convert."—p. 59.

Now see the "gains" by which these losses are counter-balanced. "Eighteen adult Romanists have attended from time to time our mission service who never attended

before. *Many others have promised to come, but have not as yet*; while a very large number are under instruction and read the Bible and tracts given them, and acknowledge openly they believe everything in the Bible, and nothing else."—ib.

Ballinakill.—"I need scarcely say that the great mass of the people are fearfully ignorant and superstitious."—p. 63.

Killery.—"I feel I should not be discharging my duty should I merely show the cheering side of the picture, whilst I pass over in silence that which is not so. I must therefore mention two cases of relapse into Romanism."—p. 64.

Achill.—"The congregation has somewhat diminished. Our schools have not been so well attended towards the close of the year as they were at the beginning. Every exertion has been made to induce the parents to take their children away from the schools. Dr. M'Hale visited the island some months ago, and urged the people to withdraw their children from the schools, to which, he said, *they are sent as little angels, and returned little devils!*"—p. 68.

Truly, these are the most candid of witnesses!

The following little histories give more than an inkling of the way in which these "conversions" are brought about.

"A—, of Lisnaskea, is, we hope, a truly pious convert from Popery; she attends church regularly, and is deeply acquainted with her Bible, which is quite a curiosity to look at, from the way it is thumbed, and scored, and underlined. She is indeed a *very interesting young woman*, and a faithful witness for the truth. *She is a servant now in the house of a pious Protestant lady, and is a regular communicant.*"—p. 16.

"C—, an intelligent, frank, fearless girl, gradually and completely gave way to the arguments of the readers, and what she heard at the inquiring class. She came to me several times, and seemed to be earnestly seeking truth, and searching the Scriptures, at the same time quite resolved to leave home. *I then took her in as a house-maid*; and soon after her mother came and told her that the money was all ready for her emigration. She went home, but found that it was all false, and only a *ruse* to get her out of my house. *I recommended her then to the*

Rev. —, who reports of her most satisfactorily, that she is an *excellent trustworthy servant*,"—pp. 16, 17. There is a strong smell of "soup" here.

On the whole, we cannot be far wrong in concluding that, as regards adult conversions, the operations of this Society are little less than a total failure. Allowing, indeed, for the admitted "relapses," or restorations to Catholic communion, and for the probable return to the Church of many who are described as having emigrated, enlisted, or otherwise removed themselves from the influences of Protestant bribery, there is good reason to hope that even the recorded gains of heresy during the year to which this Report applies, have been completely neutralized, and that the enormous expenditure of £36,444 : 15s : 4d. (a sum which in Catholic hands would have sufficed for missionary operations all over the world,) has not produced the accession of a single adult Catholic throughout the length and breadth of Ireland to the ranks of apostasy.

With the *children*, we fear, the case is otherwise. The statistics of this Society undoubtedly exhibit an amount of success in the educational department of its operations, which gives us very considerable pain. We much fear that in Ireland, as in England, many poor Catholics, who would rather suffer martyrdom than themselves be guilty of any final act against the Faith, are seduced, partly by bribes, partly by false professions, and partly by the most mistaken notion that the minds of children under eight or ten years of age are incapable of receiving any indelible impressions of false doctrine and false morality, into committing these little ones to the care of heretical teachers, who do their best to corrupt them. For the faith of the adult Irish (at least in their own country) we have no fears. But the prospect is, we confess, anxious if not alarming, as regards the rising generation. The utmost vigilance on the part of the priests, joined with an essentially Catholic system of education, can alone, under God, prevent the otherwise almost certain inroads, both of actual heresy, and, what is even a more fatal, because less assailable foe, that carelessness and indifferentism about the grand distinguishing features of the Catholic religion, which must result from a counteracting power applied with the most indefatigable pertinacity, the most dexterous ingenuity, and the most unscrupulous disregard of principle in the means by which it effects its objects. Sincerity of purpose, however grievously misdi-

rected, shall always meet with forbearance at our hands; and we desire that what we are about to say may be understood with an allowance for all which, in the sight of God, is truly the effect of invincible ignorance in this movement. But, speaking of it materially, and in the abstract, we must say unhesitatingly, that a more exact counterpart of the Tempter's work in the first Paradise we can hardly picture to ourselves, even in imagination, than is to be found in the systematic endeavour to rob a religious and united people of that Faith which is no less the cementing bond of the nation, than the foundation of the hope and the pledge of the peace of the individuals composing it.

To prevent mistakes, we close with two observations.

While we have felt it our duty, at all hazards, to set before our readers the true state of the case with regard to the actual success of *one* Protestant engine for the destruction of the Faith in Ireland, neither they, nor we must forget, that this engine is *but* one of many, and may not, for what we know, be a fair specimen of its class. Let nothing, therefore, which we have said, be taken as an encouragement to over-confidence and false security. "Legion" is the name of the evil spirit who stalks abroad in the specious form of a friend of liberty and a messenger of peace to Ireland; and the revelations of failure to which this particular Report bears witness, must not be allowed to throw us off our guard in a contest where, although vigilance be not victory, indifference would be certain ruin.

Again, the confidence we have expressed in the "tenacity of Irish faith," must not be understood to extend in all its fulness to the case of the "Irish in England." Torn from the associations of a strictly and pre-eminently Catholic country, (a loss which mere spiritual privileges cannot supply,) and plunged into the midst of an atmosphere so charged with heresy and its attendant vices, as that of an English metropolis, or large provincial town, Irish who have expatriated themselves, in ignorance of consequences, and are now mingling with a heathen population, and "learning their works," cannot, in the nature of things, present a front against heretical attack, like that which they offer to it in their own favoured land. Not that even in England we believe actual apostasy to be otherwise than the very rare exception. But, undoubtedly, England exhibits the sight, almost unknown among

the poor in Ireland, of a class of semi-Catholics, thoroughly protestantized in spirit, without being formal apostates, who bring the utmost discredit upon their country, and but too faithfully indicate the success of proselytism, either covert or avowed. It may well be imagined that the children of this class of Irish will inherit the Faith, if at all, in a most diluted and corrupted form; and, unless the progress of the evil be stayed by timely remedies, we shall have to deplore the progressive degeneracy which finds its description in the words of the Roman poet—

"Ætas parentum, pejor avis, tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturus
Progeniem vitiosiore."

In the mean time, if any one desire to know the kind of teaching employed by the agents of Proselytizing Societies, we commend them to this Report. Two specimens may suffice. We all know that the Apocrypha, although excluded by the Established Church from the Canon of Inspired Scripture, is yet allowed to be read, in the public service, for the moral edification of the people, and that its value, to this extent, is even recognized in the XXXIX. Articles. What, then, have the clergy who support this Society (including, we believe, some of the Protestant bishops) to say to the treatment of the Apocryphal books implied in the following anecdote?

"Two lads, of respectable appearance, entered the Townsend Street class, which your Missionary was conducting, and entered into a discussion on the merits of the Apocryphal books. *They were greatly struck with the argument that Suicide was countenanced in the Book of Maccabees.*" p. 28.

The other specimen which we shall exhibit, relates to a great article of the Catholic Faith, but one which many Protestants receive, at least with qualifications, and which all the more religious portion of their body are agreed in treating with reverence on account of the very sacred nature of the doctrine to which it relates. Now we ask but this question:—What sort of tone, or habit of mind, is that which is likely to be engendered by such teaching as is presupposed in the fact of mentioning with applause such a case as the following?

"A boy, in answer to a Romanist, said: *You worship*

a Saviour made of flour and water; but we worship the Saviour who created the flour and water."—p. 69.

It will be some compensation to us for the pain of even transcribing this atrocious piece of blasphemy, if it should lead candid Protestants to denounce a system so fatal to religion and morality of every kind, or, at any rate, to give us credit for good intentions, where we warn our people to shun such teachers as they would shrink from reptiles, as insidious in their approaches as they are poisonous in their bite.

ART. V.—*The Kingdom and People of Siam, with a narrative of the Mission to that Country in 1855.* By Sir John Bowring, F.R.S., Her Majesty's Plenipotentiary in China. 2 vols., 8vo. London: Parker and Son, 1857.

WE are indebted to Sir John Bowring's embassy to Siam not only for the completion of an advantageous treaty, but for a work replete with valuable and authentic information upon numerous points of interest regarding the history, antiquities, and present condition of that kingdom. It must be acknowledged, however, that the larger portion of our interest is attracted to the rulers of Siam, its two kings, and that the people are comparatively seldom before our minds. This is not owing to any undue prominence given by the author to these leading figures, although the heads of the state in any country, but more especially in the East, must always absorb the consideration of a writer to a great and perhaps not disproportionate degree. The influence of nations upon their governments, and the reaction of the government upon the people, are by no means the easiest of problems, but it is likely enough, and at all events the more probable theory, that the government is the result of the national character, and may therefore in a great measure be studied as its index. In some places, of course, the supreme power has been so unduly exalted, that those for whom it is a trust are regarded, and regard themselves as its born slaves. This circumstance

alone throws the prince into such relief, that he is the only object considered, and the people are the background of the painting, like masses of infantry, sketched in outline behind the picture of a king or general. This is not exactly the case with the kings of Siam, for it will be seen there are two, somewhat like the Augustus and Cæsar of the latter days of Rome. They do not command your attention merely by their barbaric pomp, their strings of pearls, or rivers of diamonds, their litters, fans, Arab chargers, white elephants, their gold, unwrought and coined, their harems, and janizaries. They have all these things, but you lose sight of them all in considering the personal qualities of the men. They appear to possess in common the qualities of benevolence, intelligence, and a sound appreciation of European art and literature; they also appear desirous to give their subjects the benefit of European civilization wherever they find it possible, and generally to govern in a mild and kindly spirit. The first or principal king is however by much the more remarkable man, and the second king would seem to have only followed the lead of his brother and superior. The king of the Siamese, "*Rex Siamensium*," as he writes himself, realises Mr. Carlyle's idea of a king, the cunning or knowing man of the nation, as that gentleman deduces the etymology. The king is in point of information, general accomplishments, and general merit, as well as of rank, the first man in Siam, perhaps in the East. He has a good knowledge of Latin and French, speaks and writes English with the utmost fluency, has a critical acquaintance with the language and literature of his own country, and has no common knowledge of natural philosophy, and of several of the mechanical arts. Without any leaning towards Christianity himself, he is perfectly liberal and on good terms with the Catholic and Protestant missionaries; and although favourable to European civilization, and most anxious for its diffusion amongst his subjects, we think it an argument of his good sense that he does not endeavour to impose it upon them by edict. Their abject adoration of the royal authority would probably favour in some degree an attempt of the kind, but could hardly lead to a genuine or permanent civilization. We think the late Emperor of Russia was not far astray when he said that the pretended reforms and surface civilization attempted to be imposed upon Turkey by the late Sultan, were amongst the causes of its rapid

decline. No barbarism, how stupid soever, opposes so insurmountable a barrier to progress as an old and imperfect civilization, such as obtains in most countries in the East, and in Siam amongst others. The antiquity and imperfection of the existing civilization in these countries are eminently generative of pride, the feeling of all others most unfriendly to advancement of any kind. The Turkish reforms, for instance, were all in the interest of the drill-sergeant and the tailor, but while the fanaticism and ignorance of the lower orders were left untouched, the intelligence of their superiors, civil and military, was cultivated into utter profligacy and unbelief, and the entire state, notwithstanding these prodigious ameliorations, continues to rot and drop asunder day by day, until it will become necessary for Europe some day to undertake the task that could not safely be trusted to Russia alone.

The kingdom of Siam is a fine plain of about twelve hundred miles in length, and three hundred and fifty in breadth. It adjoins the British dependencies of Malacca and Arracan; and washed upon one side by the Gulph of Siam, and on the other by the Bay of Bengal; within easy reach of Ceylon, Madras, and Calcutta; it is of the utmost importance to us to cultivate friendly relations with a state so circumstanced. It is in nominal dependence upon the Chinese Empire, and the king always pays some feudal service to the emperor, and takes a kind of investiture from him. The Siamese Government is, notwithstanding, completely independent, and although Siam is the resort of numerous Chinese, who are in fact the principal traders of the country, they are in no respect under the protection of China, or subject to any other than the law of the place. The kingdom is by no means populous, considering its extent and capabilities, the population ranging according to the most probable computation, (for none can be said to be authentic,) between four and six millions. Its history, like that of most empires, has its heroic or fabulous age, and its more or less authentic period. Sir John Bowring devotes a chapter to the annals of both, but they are full of hard names and dry facts. We shall not pause upon them, although, of course, they have a very sufficient literary and antiquarian interest. It was in the reign of Louis XIV. that Siam first came into relation with Europe, and more particularly with the court of that monarch. This was, however, a

mere episode in Siamese history, which in no way altered or distracted the main action. Siam too, as is well known, was the scene of devoted, but not very successful missionary labour, a labour which has been brought down to the present day, and which certainly meets with no obstruction from the king. We think it improbable that the king, familiar as he is with the literature of the West, has any belief in the superstitions of his country, but he has not renounced them, and it is not unlikely that, although not having any positive religious belief to fill the place of the national Buddhism, he is satisfied to allow the latter to stand, as no religion could give him more obedient or manageable subjects.

Although we cannot afford to dwell upon the history of Siam, fabulous or authentic, we think the following extract will not be found uninteresting. It contains the history of the present royal house of Siam, written by the king in English, and addressed to Sir John Bowring, as will be found, in the form of a letter. Sir John Bowring has preserved his majesty's idiom and orthography,—a circumstance which gives great character to the composition. The style is peculiar, but the proficiency of the writer is, notwithstanding, very wonderful. He is evidently unacquainted with the style of royal letters, and seems to be under the impression that the ordinary forms of politeness are as suitable to a prince as to a subject. His remarks are often those of a judicious critic, and his letter gives one altogether a most favourable impression of the Eastern monarch forgetting himself in the man and the scholar. The times and the press are, it is needless to say, very different, but assuredly the King of Siam, in his correspondence with Sir John Bowring, contrasts very favourably with Frederick of Prussia in his correspondence with Voltaire, when such a king commended such a man to God's holy keeping, a folly if he did not believe in God, and an indecency if he did.

"I requested the King," says Sir John Bowring, "to favour me with an account of his own dynasty, and received the following reply:—

"His Excellency Sir John Bowring Knighted, Doctor of Laws, the Governor of Hong Kong, &c., &c.

"RESPECTED SIR,—In regard to the particular narrative or ancient true occurrence of the present royal dynasty reigning upon Siam, I beg to say what I knew from statement of our parents and

other tolerable and corresponding families whom I have been present of in considerable space of time when they have been living or alive.

"The first family of our parternal ancestors, it is said, have been inhabitants of the City of Hanswatty, (proper Sanscrit name) the Capital of Pegu, written by Bishop Pallegoix in corrupted sound or pronouncing of Sanscrit name, 'Hongswadi,' upon the time of reign the king of that city Pegu named Jumna ti cho by Peguen name and Dusadi Sawijay by Sanscrit name (marked in the book of Bishop Pallegoix with figure 1). This family became officers of state; employed as a part of military service of that King who has conquered Ayudia in about Christian era 1552, have placed the Siamese King of Northern Siam, who have been allied to him upon the throne of whole Siam at Ayudia in the name of Phra Maha Dharmmarajadhiraj (marked 2 in the book in which the corrupted names printed, and the King marked 1, has taken the son of the King marked 2 to Pegu for security. As Siamese King promised to be dependant of the Pegu on that time, the royal son accompanied the King marked 1, named Phra Naresr (printed in book Phra Narit, and marked 3) who has been or was at Pegu during the living time or reign of the Conqueror, in demise of whom he observed the governments of Pegu being in great distress in complex opinion to establish the successor of the expired king for about half a month, has conciliated many of the inhabitants of that city in his power and took them with him, fled from thence, returned to his native land Siam, and proclaimed independancy to the Pegu again. The aforesaid family or party of officers of state then have allied with King Phra Naresr marked 3, on his returning to Siam, has accompanied him and took their residence at Ayudia, which was bestowed upon them by the King.

"A large Buddh's image was constructed at a place of worship near of their residence, remained until the present day with some ancient inscriptions.

"After the time of the King Phra Naresr, the particular narrator's statement of this family is now disappeared to us until the time of reign of Phra Narayu, printed in Book Phra Narai marked 4, reigned at Ayudia and Lawoh, about the Christian year 1656 to 1682. On the reign of this King, two brothers, extraordinary persons, have been descendants of the said family; became most pliant to the King who has appointed the other brother in place or office of the lord of foreign affairs, in name or title of 'Chau Phya Phra Khlang,' who has been at presence of the receipt of the French Embassy visited Siam upon that time, and the younger brother of his Excellency Phya Phra Khlang, named Mr. Pal, was appointed head of Siamese Embassy to France of return of friendship with the French Government, and met with being wrecked, lost of his ship at Cape of Good Hope, where he, with his suit, remained during considerable while, and afterwards became to

France, met with favourable treatment of the French Government upon that time, and returned to Siam when his elder brother was died. The King Phra Narayu has appointed him (Mr. Pal) the head of embassy in the office of his elder brother, the Lord of foreign affairs. 'Chau Phya Phra Khlang' from this person extraordinary, our ancestors were said to be descendants; but their office and affairs in royal service were not continued in generations during a few reign of that majesties Siamese King who succeeded his Majesty the King Phra Narayu, until the time of his majesty Bhumindr Rajatdhiraj reigned upon Siam since the Christian year 1706 to 1732, in which the first person being father of the first King, and grandfather of the royal father of the present King (myself) and late King (my late brother) of Siam, was an extraordinary son of a family descended from aforesaid lords of foreign affairs, who removed their situation at Ayudia for happiness of lives, and selected their place at 'Sakutrang,' a port on small river, being branch of great river, at the connected realms of Northern and Southern Siams, at about latitude N. 13° 15' 30" more little, and longitude 99° 90' E. The said extraordinary person was born there and became man of skill and knowledge and ability of royal service, came from Sakutrang to Ayudia, where he was introduced to the royal service, and became married with a beautiful daughter of a Chinese richest family at Chinese compound, or situation within wall of city and in south eastern corner of Ayudia, and became pleased by the Kings marked 5 and 6, and appointed in office of the preparer of royal letters and communication for northern direction (i. e., for all state or regions of both dependencies, and in dependency to Siam at northern direction) and protector of the great royal seal for that purpose being, his title was, His Excellency Phra Acksom, Sundom, Smiantra. He has five children; his first wife who afterwards was died, and has recently married with the younger sister of his late wife, with whom he has a single daughter.

"In particular of the aforesaid five children, the first was a son, became man in the service of the Second King in the time of the King of Siam, marked 6, and leaving a sole daughter only, was died before Ayudia was conquered by Burman Army. The second and third were her daughters, their descendants many remained, the royal mother or the present Major and second King of Siam, (myself and my younger brother) was a daughter being third child of the latter. The fourth was an extraordinary son, became the first King of Siam in the present dynasty, marked in the book 8, who was born in March, 1736, of Christian Era, and of whom the present and late Kings of Siam, (myself and my late brother) were grandchildren, and the fourth was the person who was born in September 1743 of the Christian Era, and who became finally the second King upon the reign of his elder brother here, and died before his brothers death six years. The firstly said Ancestor 'Phra Acksom Sundom Smiantra,' has also another ille-

gitimate son, being youngest born from a maid servant whom he (H. E. our ancestor) has take with him, went to Northern Siam, upon the time of the Ayudia, being seized by the Burman Army in the Christian years 1765 and 1766, to obtain new situation or station for refuge, leaving here all above said legitimate sons and daughters who were married and live with their own families for the consequences of difficulty in going with large party in very hurricane and hindering manner of journey.

"He on his arrival at Phitsanulok, the great city at Northern Siam, became regent or superintendent of supreme governor of that city, where he was died of fever and burn by his maid wife and the son born of her. His relicks was brought here by them and was delivered to his legitimate children here, and remained in our royal house of worship of royal ancestors, until the present day.

"And his two extraordinary son upon lossing of Ayudia; took refuge at various places, and afterwards became combined with the king Phya Tarksing first of Bangkokese kings, marked 7 in book; finally the elder was appointed the supreme general Chau Phya Chukkry, the Lord Regent of Country, and afterward styled in name or title and dignity of Maha Krasute Suk, *id est* 'the king of War,' who has resisted Burman Armies came to take station of Siam every year upon that time.

"The younger was appointed king of Northern Siam governing at Phisnuloke, where his father has been and died. He bore the name of Chau Phya 'Surasint,' so upon that time there were three kings presented in Siam, viz., Supreme King 'Phya Tark,' King of War, our grandfather, and the latter said King of Northern Siam, on the year of Christian Era 1781, when two brother kings were sent to tranquil Cambodia, which was in distress or disturbance of rebellion, the king Phya Tarsing, marked 7, remained here. He came mad or furious, saying, he is Buddh and put many persons of innocents to death, more than 10,000 men, and compelled the people to pay various amounts of money to royal treasure with any lawful taxes and reasonable army; so here great insurgents took place, who apprehended the next king and put to death, and sent them prisoners to Cambodia and invited two kings of war and of Northern Siam to return here for the crown of whole Siam and its dependency.

"Our grandfather was enthroned and crowned in May 1782, in name of 'Phra Budhyot fa Chulatoke,' marked in book 8; his reign continued 27 years. His demise took place in the year 1809, in which our father has succeeded him. His coronation took place in August 1809. His reign continued happily 15 years. His expiration took place in the year 1824, in month of July. His royal name 'Phra Budh, Lord Luh nobhaluy,' marked 9 (names of these two kings were printed in book by Bishop Palagoix 'Phoen din ton' and 'Phoen din Klang.') These names, improper as they were, very popular and vulgar are 'Phoen din ton,' i.e., former or first reign,

Phen din Klang,' i.e., middle or next reign only, not royal tittle.

"Our older brother, the late king succeeded our royal father. His coronation took place on August 1824. His name was Param Dharwik rajahdhiraj (proper Sanskrit) and in Siamese name Phra Nangklaui Chau yu Acca. His reign continued 26 years; his demise took place on 2nd April 1851. Then my succession to him concluded and I was crowned on May 15th of that year. My name in Siam is Phra Chomklau Chau yu hua, and I bear the sanskrit name as ever signed in my several letters,

"S. P. P. M. MONGKUT,

"incontract that are

"SOMDETH PHRA, PARAMENDR MAHA MONGKUT,

"Rex Siamensium."

—Vol. 1. pp. 62, 69.

Sir John Bowring, after going at considerable length into the history of Siam, gives an interesting account of many particulars, in their manners, customs, superstitions, and amusements. He also avails himself pretty largely of the labours of former travellers, as many of their descriptions applicable to Siam two hundred years ago are equally applicable to-day. Thus, he quotes Kämpfen, Diego de Couto, Murray, Abeel, Father Le Blanc, Bruguière La Loubère, and makes constant reference to Bishop Pallegoix, than whom, he says, no writer is better entitled to speak from experience. Mgr. Pallegoix is not what could be called a traveller, although his travels have been very extensive indeed. He has long been at the head of the Catholic Mission in Siam, and his works, as will be seen from the foregoing extract, are well known to the king, whose accurate criticism, as may have been observed, suffers not even an orthographical error to escape. And indeed, while reading that part of the king's letter in which he notices the singular mistake by which the Bishop substitutes the description of the reign for the name of the prince, it occurred to us to reflect what execrable nonsense, to say no worse, must be contained in the Bible Society's versions of the Scriptures in Eastern or in barbarous languages. The Latin-speaking nations, it is well known, adopted some of their combinations, such as *mecum* and *secum*, for the express purpose of avoiding sounds, to which vulgar use attached coarse or otherwise offensive meanings; and can it be doubted that if any of

those pretended versions of the Scripture ever meet the eye of an intelligent native, their effect must be to bring the religion, of which such a rigmarole is the exponent, into derision and contempt. To return, however, to our immediate subject. Bishop Pallegoix describes the Siamese as quiet, cheerful, timid, and almost passionless. "They are," he says, "disposed to idleness, inconstancy, and exaction; they are liberal alms-givers, severe in enforcing decorum in the relations between the sexes. They are fond of sports, and lose half their time in amusements. They are sharp, and even witty in conversation, and resemble the Chinese in their aptitude for imitation." Their tenderness for the animal creation, encouraged by the Buddhist superstition, is another feature in the national character, and prevails to that extent, that they are unwilling to kill vermin, and reptiles, although flesh meat and fish are to be found at the tables of the rich. The practice of opium eating, although highly penal, has, it appears, been introduced into the kingdom; other narcotics are also used to produce the same effects, but the national luxury now regarded as a necessity, is the areca, a species of nut, which grows upon a tree in the nature of a palm. The kernel of this nut, seasoned with quick lime, and wrapped in betel leaf, the Siamese chew for hours together, alternating the process with immoderate tobacco smoking, and such is their passion for betel, that "were the choice," writes Sir John Bowring, "offered to a hungry Siamese, of food, or his favourite betel, there is no doubt he would reject the first and ask for the second in preference."

Polygamy is allowed in Siam to whatever extent the fortune of the husband will allow, but there is in general one wife of superior dignity, who is considered the legitimate spouse; but notwithstanding that parents generally seem to take pride in the number of their children, the population, as we have already seen, is thin. Poverty must always be a restraint upon polygamy, but it is well known that the system, so far as it reaches, is unfavourable to population, and there are besides, many concurrent circumstances which the author enumerates, all working in the same direction.

The ceremonies with which the principal events in the life of a Siamese, his birth, education, marriage, and death, are ushered in or followed, are given in considerable de-

tail by Sir John Bowring, and are sufficiently peculiar to make us wish we could ourselves enter into them a little more at large. He also devotes a sufficient portion of the work to a description of the animal and vegetable productions of the country, and there are distinct chapters for the legislation, manufactures, religion, commerce, revenues, language, and literature of Siam. We regret our inability to afford even a glance at each. Under one or other of these heads there are few subjects of interest at all likely to fall under the observation of an enquirer like Sir John Bowring, which have not been examined by him, and fairly as well as carefully stated. We found it difficult to make a selection where everything is interesting and important, but there are some circumstances in connection with the institution of slavery in Siam, which contrast so forcibly with the features of the same institution elsewhere, that we feel constrained to dwell upon them for a moment. The existence of slavery under any circumstances is a terrible evil. The Church has ever discountenanced, and has usually succeeded in extinguishing it wherever her power was sufficient. True, there is such a thing as the lawful relation of master and slave, but it is a relation so dryly and nakedly lawful, so little protected or favoured by Heaven, that an innocent slaveholder is an abstraction, a possibility, or little more. The conditions of the slave in the few Catholic countries that still incur the responsibility and disgrace of upholding such a system is admittedly preferable to that of the slave in the United States, whose condition is the most pitiable and hopeless of all. But in Siam, although one-third of the population is in slavery, the condition of the slave would seem to be far less unhappy than in any other country. The slaves are universally well treated, and have clearly defined rights. They are usually devoted to their masters, and confinement in irons is the extreme punishment to which they can be subjected by their masters, who, however, may hand them to the king to be dealt with as convicts, but the men so treated are such as would be liable to the punishment of convicts in England. Some of these remarks apply to all classes of slaves existing in Siam, namely those captured in war, and who belong to the king; those who are purchased, or in conformity with the old Roman legislation, forfeit their liberty for debt; and those who are born slaves. Slaves of the two

last classes each represent a certain sum of money, and if dissatisfied with their masters, upon tendering their estimated value in money, they are entitled to their discharge. Breakage, or dilapidations, are charged to the account of the slave, and must be included in his ransom. Various services, voluntary or other, rendered by the slave to his master, cover the amount of ransom; and altogether the laws with reference to the slaves are a carefully prepared and by no means unfriendly code. There are various such classifications of slaves, and there are many circumstances under which the slave obtains his freedom without purchase; but in general the kindness and confidence of the master are such, and they are so warmly returned by the slave, that the latter, when emancipated, returns if he can to the service of the same master, and if not, rarely fails to obtain another as good.

Before passing to a more important subject, we shall borrow from Sir John Bowring a graphic description of the reverence with which the Siamese treat their superiors, and which he accurately characterises as a species of adoration.

"So absolute is submission that the severest punishments emanating from the authorities are submitted to without murmuring. A mandarin being imprisoned in order to be punished, a Frenchman offered to intercede for him with his superior: 'No,' replied he, 'I would see how far his love would reach,' and this was said, not ironically, but was the Siamese interpretation of what a European would have rendered by 'I wait to see how far his rigour will extend.' The king said to the French envoy, that his subjects have the temper of asses, who tremble so long as one holds the end of their chain, and who disown their master when the band is loosed.

"The groundwork of all Siamese institutions and habits is a reverence for authority. This principle is pushed to forms of the most extravagant excess, on the one side of assumption, and on the other of prostration. It influences language so far as to create vocabularies utterly unlike one another, to be employed in the various grades of society; it is exhibited in the daily usages of life in shapes the most inconvenient and ridiculous. No man of inferior rank dares to raise his head to the level of that of his superior; no person can cross a bridge if an individual of higher grade chances to be passing below; no mean person may walk upon a floor above that occupied by his betters. There was an expression of extreme distress from the Siamese, when

on board the Rattler some images of Buddha were found in the cabin, over whose heads common sailors were permitted to tread the deck. Honours almost divine, language quite devotional, humiliations the most degrading, mark the distance between sovereign and subject; and to some extent the same reverence is paid to age which is exhibited towards authority. The paternal relations are associated with forms and phrases of habitual respect, and the honouring father and mother has more than the force of a commandment—it is an hourly observance.

"Precedence of *position* is thus laid down. 'The right hand is more honourable than the left'—(this is wholly contrary to Chinese usages which invariably recognise the left side as the seat of honour)—'the floor opposite the door more honourable than the sides, the sides more honourable than the wall where the door is, and the wall which is on the right hand of him that sits on the floor, more honourable than that on his left hand; in the tribunals no persons sit on the bench which is fixed to the wall directly opposite the door except the president who also has a determinative voice. Councillors who have only a consultative voice are seated on the lower benches along the middle walls, and other meaner officers along the wall of the side where the door is.'

"In addressing an equal the Siamese use the word *than*, meaning master, and call themselves *kha*, servant; to a superior they say *Chau kha*. But the terms of humility on the one side and of assumption on the other rise and fall with the difference and distance of rank. Crouched in the dust before a dignitary, the language employed by the speaker is, 'Your slave—a hair—an animal *dixan*,' the diminutive of *devaxan*, 'a little beast,' or some equally depreciatory phrase. No man approaches a person of the higher orders without prostrating himself, raising his hands over his head, and bending his body low. To the highest authority there must be three separate acts of adoration, and the word *khoraab*, which means 'obedience to order,' constantly interlards the conversation. 'When the Portuguese interpreter saw the Phrakhleng, though at the distance of twenty or thirty yards, he bent his body and crept along like a sportsman approaching the game unobserved. In this inclining position he continued until within a few yards of the object of his reverence, when he laid himself prostrate on the ground, and waited the order of his superior.' This is the universal method of inferiors entering into the presence of persons of higher rank.

"Other forms are—'lord benefactor at whose feet I am;' to a prince, 'I the dust of your august feet'—'I the sole of your foot;'—to the king 'mighty and august lord! divine mercy! I a dust grain of your sacred feet;' and of the king, the usual phraseology is 'the divine order,'—'the master of life'—'sovereign of the earth'—'guardian of the Bonzes.' The ordinary phrase in the presence of majesty is *ton xramong* 'placed on my head.' The most common

royal title, and that usually found in the sacred books is *Phra ong*, meaning literally 'the divine personage.'

"Bruguière says that the words *to reign*—*saenival*—means literally 'to devour the people.'—Vol. i. pp. 124, 127.

Sir John Bowring devotes a chapter of the first volume to the existing Christian missions, and in the second volume he gives a brief history of each of the missions, some apostolic and some diplomatic, which the great nations of Europe sent to Siam at various periods. With reference to the present missions, he states what we unreservedly believe, the very natural fact that the Protestant and Catholic missions go a great way to neutralize each other. It is not surprising that when there are two parties in presence whose teachings are directly contradictory, and who each profess to deliver the one true Christian doctrine, a very large number of those who are called upon to choose between Christ and Buddha, should be grievously at a loss to know what Christianity actually is, and should prefer holding by what they do know in preference to what there seems no likelihood of their discovering. In the simplicity of his heart Sir John Bowring recommends an evangelical alliance between the Catholics and Methodists, and encourages them to treat each other as fellow-labourers. We need not dwell upon the extravagance of such a proposal. There should be two parties to any such arrangement, and if *per impossibile* the Methodist should be ready for a compromise, the Catholic would cease to be a Catholic, by the bare fact of its acceptance. The Catholics were in possession when the Methodists and Presbyterians made their appearance, and upon the latter of course lies the responsibility of all the harm done. The mission was of a sufficiently arduous description without requiring difficulties of this kind to complicate it. Strange to say, the professors of the most stupid and monstrous superstitions are often the most subtle disputants and clever objectors when Christianity is offered to their acceptance. There is no unsoundness, real or apparent, which they do not at once detect and turn to surprising account. The missionary career of St. Francis Xavier furnished numerous instances of the kind we mention, and Sir John Bowring gives a very remarkable specimen of a dialogue between a Protestant Missionary and a Siamese Mandarin, in which the answers of the latter are evidently of a kind to disconcert any but the most accomplished reasoners; and we cannot but

think that the greatest logician in the world, imperfectly acquainted with the language, would, without a very marked and almost miraculous interposition of Providence, completely fail. Sir John Bowring goes at some length into the causes of the comparative failure of the early missions, and the nearly complete failure of the existing missions, notwithstanding the toleration so liberally extended by the government to all. La Loubère, upon whom he draws for many of his facts and reasons, does undoubtedly supply a great many circumstances confirmatory of the views he entertained. He also quotes the general practice of St. Francis Xavier, and the early missionaries, in the sustaining of his opinion, that the prejudices of heathens are not to be too rudely dealt with, that the prudence of the serpent is to be called into requisition, that the philosophy, and even what is sound in the theology, of those whom you seek to evangelise, must be turned to account, and that every custom not absolutely incompatible with Christianity, must be tenderly handled and even preserved. This has indeed been the practice of the Church in all her missions where she has been allowed anything like freedom of action. It was more particularly the practice of the Jesuits, who in China adopted and consecrated whatever in the Chinese philosophy, manners, and even ceremonies and belief, they did not consider inconsistent with the Christian faith and morality. A stupid outcry was raised in Europe. An order was obtained from Rome, under what circumstances or by what influences it is needless to enquire now, disapproving the connexion of these ceremonies and practices with the Christian faith, and the result was just what might be expected, and what would have taken place in Saxon England a thousand years ago, had Gregory the Great forbidden the adoption of Saxon customs and observances. His wisdom has been seen and recognized even by Protestant writers, and there have not been wanting Protestant writers to condemn the ill-omened measure which threw Christianity two or three centuries back in the Chinese empire.

With reference to the indiscriminate circulation of the Scriptures La Loubère has an observation in which we are inclined to think Sir John Bowring concurs, although without an express statement of his concurrence. The Scriptures, according to the views of La Loubère, should not be thrust into the hands of Eastern heathens in parti-

cular, without preparation or comment. The same thing in our view of course holds good for Western Christians ; but La Loubère lays his finger upon some of the passages which will only scandalize and disgust a heathen, at the same time that they give a completely erroneous view of the doctrines of Christianity. How, he inquires, can the language of the Saviour regarding His mother and His brethren, unexplained and unaccounted for, be regarded by natives, whose reverence for the parental authority has grown into a species of instinct? We might point to Scripture texts more offensive still even to the right sense of an Eastern heathen, Siamese, Chinese, or Hindoo. What could he think, for instance, of an unexplained book in which he should read, that unless a man were to *hate* his father and mother he could not have life everlasting? La Loubère quotes also the text, "Let the dead bury their dead," and adds, "what more abhorrent amongst people whose funeral rites form the most sacred of duties and obligations?" Further on Sir John Bowring himself says upon the same subject,—

"It may be doubted if the profuse and indiscriminate circulation of bibles and books is a judicious proceeding, or likely to be accepted as evidence of the value attached by the giver to the gift. One of the missionaries acknowledges that sheets of white paper would be yet more carefully sought. Hundreds of thousands of printed tracts and treatises have been scattered broad cast over Siam and China. Has the result responded to that expectation? Has the seed grown up into the harvest of promise? Great reverence is attached to *books*, as books among the Buddhists. It may well be questioned whether it is wise and prudent to fling them to all the winds as our missionaries fling "their seed" in the hopes that some will fall into good ground and bring forth a hundred fold. No such seeds have hitherto fallen—no such good ground has hitherto received those seeds. I doubt not the ultimate prevalence of truth, of Christian as well as all other truth; but it is impossible to close our eyes to the sad, the very sad, but most undoubted fact, that spite of sacrifices the most heroic, zeal the most devoted, liberality the most unbounded, little, almost nothing has been done. I ask not the discontinuance of missionary labours, but the calm consideration of the causes of failure, of the incredibly small returns for immensely great exertions."—Vol. I. pp. 377-378.

The Siamese mission inaugurated by St. Francis Xavier, but in strictness commenced by De la Motte Lambert, Bishop of Berythus in partibus, was far more successful amongst the Chinese and Annamites, who form

so considerable a portion of the population of Siam, than amongst the Siamese themselves. It was not, however, without success even amongst the latter, but it had the misfortune of royal patronage from Europe, the patronage of Louis XIV., and as is always the case in similar instances became connected in the mind of the native princes with the political schemes, real or imputed, of the European king. As in the case of Japan, this led to persecution, but fortunately not to the extinction of Christianity. The Siamese appear to be a kindly race, but there has been no succession of kings unfavourable to Christianity. Fortunately, too, although the Dutch were in the neighbourhood of Siam, as in that of Japan, to keep up any passing exasperation, and to see that no pause or respite should be allowed to the little flock; they did not find it necessary to do so in the present instance, and the flock was allowed to come to shelter after each dispersion.

In the year 1830, Mgr. Pallegoix, the present Vicar Apostolic of Siam, was appointed to reorganize the Mission, and since then, as Sir John Bowring observes, the Catholics have laboured with unremitting activity, and have also established missions in Cambodia and Laos. The numbers and distribution of the Catholic population in Siam, are stated to be as follows, upon the authority (we presume) of Mgr. Pallegoix:—

In Bangkok	4050
Ayuthia and Salaburi	200
Petru and Bangplasoi	300
Nakhonxaisi and Baug Xang	300
Chantaburi	1100
Jongsilang	500
Dispersed and in Slavery	600
					<hr/> 7050

Under the government of the Bishop, are his Vicar, eight European, and four native priests. There are also comprised in the Mission, thirty students, four convents occupied by twenty-five nuns, five schoolmasters for boys, and fifteen catechists, mostly Chinese. The native priests are supported by their own congregation, and the mission receives from what Dr. Bowring calls the Propaganda, but which must of course mean the society for the propagation of the faith, 20,000 francs a

year, reduced, it is said, one-fourth by the rate of exchange, so that the resources of the Mission, from that quarter, amount to just £600 per annum, and are brought up in other ways to £746 accounted for as follows:—

Viaticum of the Vicar Apostolic	£52	per an.
" of nine Missionaries, £26 each	234	"
Subsidy to Native Priests	40	"
" to the Nuns	40	"
Expenses of the Seminary	160	"
15 Catechists £8 each	120	"
Printing	40	"
Expenses of the Mission barges	32	
Rosaries and objects of devotion	28	

£746

The Protestant missions are three in number, connected with various denominations of American protestants, but their native adherents do not appear to amount to more than thirty-five individuals. They were under some restrictions previous to the arrival of Sir John Bowring, but, at his Excellency's instance, were removed by the King. Mgr. Pallegoix gives the following account of the Protestant missions.

"Twenty-seven years ago, American Protestant Ministers established themselves in Bangkok; some dispense medicines, others preach or keep little schools, which do not prosper. Their great object is to print and distribute versions of the Bible in Siamese and Chinese. They have four presses in activity, they incur enormous expenses; their Bibles circulate throughout the country, and yet many persons have assured me that in twenty-seven years, they have not baptised twenty-seven Chinamen, and those they have baptised are people in their service. The Siamese cannot persuade themselves that one can be a priest and a married man. Thus they never call them Phra (or Priest) but Khru (Master) or Mó (Doctor). Besides, the six families of ministers are divided into three sects, which is not likely to inspire confidence."*—Vol. I, p. 373-4.

Sir John Bowring makes graceful mention of the services rendered by the Catholic missionaries to philology, of which indeed the Siamese and Latin grammar and dictionary, published in Paris at the cost of the government,

* Pallegoix, ii. 319-20.

are a sufficient proof. His description of the capital and court of Siam, it is needless to say, are full of interest. There are few, however, who have not at one time or another, made acquaintance with Bangkok and its wonders, including the white elephant, a few hairs from the tail of which were confided to Sir John Bowring for presentation to her Majesty, as a gift of no mean value, and worthy the acceptance of one whom the king of Siam must regard as one of the greatest princes in the world. The information to be derived from Sir John Bowring's pages is not indeed confined to matters of this description, although in the economy of Siamese government they are of the highest importance. The capital and court of every country are its characteristic features, nowhere are they more characteristic than in Siam, and, as it would appear to us, no description can trace them more accurately than that of Sir John Bowring. In the first chapter of the second volume, he gives an account of some of the principal dependencies of Siam, including Laos, Cambodia, and Quedah. His Excellency became acquainted with Mgr. Miché, the vicar apostolic of Cambodia, in Bangkok, to which city the bishop had come for the recovery of his health. Sir John Bowring refers to the circumstance with a pleasure which is very gratifying, and pays an ample tribute to the good qualities and devotedness of the bishop. "From him," says Sir John, "I learnt many interesting particulars as to the produce and prospects of the country which is the field of his missionary labours. He seemed earnestly devoted to his work, careless of privation, dangers, and sufferings. He had lately traversed the perilous jungle, where, day after day, and night after night, he found scarcely the trace of man—no succour, no shelter—the elephants which conveyed him making their way through the scarcely ever traversed forests. But, though oppressed with lassitude and sickness, I heard no complaint; his path of duty seemed clear before him, and in that he resolutely walked. It is impossible to look on the dedication of these missionary wanderers, to the task allotted to them by their master, without wonder and admiration. No amount of labour or of privation, no manner of peril, persecution, or even death, diverts them from their onward but often darksome way." A long and important chapter is devoted to the history of the diplo-

matic and commercial relations, from time to time established between Siam and the Western nations; and the last chapter, containing the personal journal of His Excellency's visit to Siam, is also of extreme interest. There are as many as seven appendices, containing amongst other matters, some notices of the history of Siam, and detached portions of historical narrative, all drafted by the King of Siam, and some of them retouched for the press. Sir John Bowring has reprinted *verbatim et literatim*, from a MS. in the handwriting of the king, an account of the death of the late queen, or in truth her biography, for he gives a sufficiently detailed account of her not very eventful life, up to the period of her last illness. The account shows him to have been a very attentive observer, for he notes with the accuracy of a physician all the symptoms of her illness, and all the medicines or other remedies made use of during its course. Before closing this paper we think it will not be taken amiss if we give a specimen or two of His Majesty's correspondence with Sir John Bowring. The following is the first letter received from the king immediately upon his arrival at Bangkok.

(No. 38.)

"Royal Audience Hall, Grand Palace,
"Bangkok, 20th March, 1855.

"MY RESPECTED GRACIOUS FRIEND,—I am now indeed very glad for your Excellency's arrival, as mostly as it is the fulfilling of my longly expecting mind and earnest desire of personal respect with your Excellency, which would be better than our faithful correspondence between us, which were continued so long as for many years ago.

"I have informed your Excellency's arrival to all members of our government; they are all very glad, and trusting that the visit of your Excellency is peaceful, and your Excellency is my intimate corresponding friend, from whom they expect favourable discussions of treaty, &c.

"On yesterday morning after your Excellency's arrival being just learned less than an hour, I had written the foregoing of No. 37 immediately, and sent down to sea together some articles of food,—Siamese fruit, abundant in the present season, and some Siamese manufactured sweet articles, cakes, &c., in hand of my private ministers Mssrs. Nai Kham, Nai Suong raj bar han, and Nai Bhoo, (the latter of whom your Excellency would remember) to present your Excellency my first respect and cordial welcome heartily.

"But I am little sorry that they both were or are not acquired with but little knowledge of English, so your Excellency would

know my being glad, but personal of my letter or through interpreter.

"To-day, I beg to send your Excellency some articles of salt food put in six bottles, and six pints of salt fishes and venison; the latter may be for your Excellency's retinue or accompany, all aforesaid articles in hand in charge of the bearer hereof who is a gentleman and my private minister, 'Mom Kou tae, who acquired with considerable way of English language in speaking and writing, whom I could not get to send down on yesterday. I trust your Excellency will please to converse with him.

"I have ordered his Excellency 'Chau Phya, Sri—Suriy, Wongso' Samuh Phra Kralahom to accept your Excellency at Parknam with great respect and consult with your Excellency to do well, profess in what manner your Excellency will be conveyed to this city. He got down last night and now in Parknam. Your Excellency's messengers who went to proceed to this city for witnessing the prepared residence of your Excellency are allowed to come according to their pleasure. It is said they will come up tomorrow. I beg to assure your Excellency that all things here will be in peaceful manner and gracious respects.

"I wish your Excellency to be here as long for many days as possible to your Excellency. Do not fear for our expenses, &c., as I wish to enjoy the entertainment with such a noble and favourable friend as your Excellency are to me.

"I beg to remain your Excellency's faithful friend,

"S. P. P. M. MONGKUT,

"The King of Siam.

"To his Excellency SIR JOHN BOWRING,

"Kt, Dr. of Law, &c., &c."

The proper officials having some scruples with regard to the European style of complimenting a prince by discharges of artillery, the king at once proceeds to gratify the ambassador by the acceptance of the compliment, and communicates his intention in the following letter.

(No. 43.)

"Rajonty House, Grand Palace,

"3 April, 1855, 10 p.m.

"MY DEAR FRIEND.—In your Excellency's conversation with our noble two heads of private ministers to day, regard the salute of 21 guns on board *Rattler* which would be up to the new fortification below the city tomorrow, they (two my ministers have declared) the Siamese custom and forbidden the one salute of 21 guns. Now I have resolved to allow according to your Excellency's custom and pleasure of much respect towards myself; so agreeably to your

Excellency pleasure, I have issued my proclamation (printed in thin papers, one of which enclosed herewith) among our citizen and people forbidding their alarm. I beg, therefore, to permit or agree that 21 guns on board the steamer *Rattler* shall be fired in salute on her arrival at directed place of anchor near of new fort. Then on the end of 21st gun our military party upon fort will answer with the same number. Please order to your Excellency's captain of steamer to salute according to English custom.

"This from your Excellency Friend,

"(signed) S. P. P. M. MONGKUT,

"The King of Siam.

"To his Excellency SIR JOHN BOWRING,

"K., L.L. D., &c., &c."

—Vol. ii. pp. 422, 423.

(*Enclosure.*)

"A Royal proclamation of the Senior king condescending graciously to the vested tuft and crown of the people, giving, them to know conveniently throughout every magistrates district, that the British envoy who has come at this time is a person who has been intimately acquainted in and under the soles and dust of the sacred feet for a long time past. For this reason he condescending graciously to the vested tuft and crown, allows the fire-ship being a war vessel, that which has now arrived to come up to the mouth of canal Phadong Krung Kasem below. If when the fire-ship shall come up and the captain fire large guns, a salute of 21 guns to the powers of the great angelic city, and the soldiers in the fort Pitpatchanak shall fire another 21 guns, being altogether 42 guns, let not the people be frightened or startled at all by any means. This firing of guns is the custom of vessels of war, like the custom of juunks to beat gong mutually.

"Published on Teusday the 5th month, the 1st evening of the waning moon in the year of the Rabbit, and the 6th year of the cycle of ten."—Vol. ii. pp. 427, 428.

Nothing could exceed the delicate courtsey with which the English envoy was treated throughout his stay in Bangkok, or the frankness with which the treaty, the object of his mission, was discussed and finally arranged by the Siamese ministers, and ratified by the king. In addition to the great service which Sir John Bowring has rendered to the country by conducting to a successful issue a treaty of such importance, the public is very much his debtor for the valuable contribution to its information, which has resulted from that mission, in the shape of these volumes. We have

rarely met with a book that inspires a more pleasing interest, and what is far better, we feel that in recommending it to the reader we can adopt the words of Montaigne and say,

C'est icy un Livre de bonne foy Lecteur.

ART. VI.—*Philosophie Morale*. Par N. J. Laforet, D.D. etc., Professeur a la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, et Président du Collège du Pape, a l'Université Catholique du Louvain. Nouvelle édition. Louvain, 1855.

THE word Moral Philosophy in our English tongue, and as used by our writers, has two significations perfectly distinct. The one general amongst men of letters, the other peculiar and proper to a small, and it may be, comparatively unlettered few. In the former sense, Moral Philosophy, or as it is more generally called, Moral Science, embraces much weighty and valuable matter. It discourses of God, of our soul, of this world. It treats of the laws which govern thought, of their independence of those other laws which rule the material world, of the nature and origin of our soul, of the free will by which we administer the affairs of our own economy, of the endless destinies which await our exit from the shifting scenes of this life. It investigates the character of material existence, scrutinizes its dependency, traces its temporal origin. And rising from effects to their cause, it unfolds the reasons which constrain the mind to acknowledge the existence and infinite perfection of the Supreme Being; it deduces the nature and character of His Divine attributes, His immensity, ubiquity, eternity, simplicity, omnipotence, omniscience, foreknowledge: and setting before us, as in a mirror, how we have been created and preserved, how His loving Providence has watched, and ever watches over us,—it leaves us impressed with the most intimate conviction of our complete dependence on His Almighty Goodness and Power. Such are the topics involved in the term Moral Science, as it is used in our

universities and colleges, as it denominates a *section* at the meetings of the British Association, and as it appears in the title pages of solemn-looking books. We know the term includes more—discourses on the Moral Law, on human obligation, &c. But of these we shall speak anon.

But the few English or Irish laymen who may have studied in the Continental Universities, who are even slightly versed in Continental literature, know a very different signification of the term Moral Philosophy. For them it means what it sounds, the *Philosophy of Moral Acts*. It examines the origin, nature, and extent of the Natural Law; the source of Moral Obligation; the sanction which attaches to the observance or violation of the Law. Starting from the general notion of Duty, it investigates its several ramifications, and defines our relations to God, ourselves and our fellows. The fulfilment of these duties produces within us a facility or readiness of action; such a facility is virtue. Such is Moral Philosophy as it is understood all over the Continent. It involves neither more nor less. A Continental philosopher would as soon dream of treating subjects belonging to natural theology, or psychology, when discussing Moral Philosophy, as he would think of introducing the perturbations of Uranus and Neptune into a treatise on elementary algebra. Each science has its own department, as it has its own name; and as amongst us geometry and mechanics mean very different things, so on the Continent very different are Metaphysics and Moral Philosophy.

There is scarce a branch of speculative knowledge which is so little known amongst us; there are few whose study would be more useful at the present day. In a mixed society, presenting every shade of moral, political, and individual variety of opinion, at a time when questions of the most vital interest to the community and to each man severally are agitated,—questions which regard the very foundation of social order, the essential differences of moral good and evil—we cannot turn to the teaching of religion for decisive instruction, for we have not religion in common with those who are without the pale of the Church. Reason, truly and solidly developed, the teaching of this science which professes to unfold the nature and foundation of our duties, can alone supply us with arguments by which to decide those questions. And we are the more

particularly induced to hope that our rising Catholic youth will be attracted hither by reason of our new university. Its nomenclature will hardly correspond with that of our Protestant literature; its science will be the full Catholic philosophy taught for ages in our Continental schools, and not the meagre fragments which have been preserved with difficulty here.

And for this reason we return our most hearty thanks to M. Laforet for his valuable work. From opinions which he occasionally puts forward we must dissent. But about his merit as an author, as a clear and able exponent of the truth, there can be no dispute. We shall, we think, render a service, neither unimportant nor superfluous, if, availing ourselves of the treatise of M. Laforet, we attempt to present our readers with a more detailed and exact account of *La Philosophie Morale*, than can well be furnished without the help of a foreign literature. The author's preface informs us of how he came to write his work. He tells us how, from the date of his appointment, he began to study the more famous writers on moral philosophy. Amongst those writers were some of the Fathers—especially Saint Augustine—and the great scholastic theologians. The perusal of their writings disclosed the most elevated and extensive views on the most difficult questions of moral philosophy.

"Compared with the writings of these eminent men, the moral treatises of the moderns appear to us in general weak. These words may seem paradoxical to a certain class of readers; but they are yet true. We meet men otherwise well instructed, but strangers by their education to the scientific traditions of the Church, who fancy that the science of morality and natural right is of modern creation, and who above all do not dream that it is possible to find its principles among the authors of the middle age. If these men had only the courage to open and glance at the *Summa* of St. Thomas they would see to what modern discoveries may be reduced. And yet there are other writers of that epoch, but too little known, such as St. Anselm and St. Bonaventure, who, on capital questions of morality and natural right, exhibit views sometimes more profound than those in the beautiful work of the Angelic Doctor. The merit of the moderns is the having classed in stricter order the ideas which should enter into moral philosophy, and the philosophy of right; but for profoundness and comprehensiveness of views, with some rare exceptions, they are certainly not comparable to the ancients.

"Modern authors have applied themselves more to place in order,

and systematize moral ideas; and of this merit we esteem the value very highly, for without a rigorous order of ideas science were impossible. And if it be true to say that on the score of order and of method, the moderns surpass the ancients; it is also certain that even at this day moral philosophy is far from presenting a system precisely conceived and rigorously connected. It seems to us that in no treatise of morals do we find a general principle, truly philosophical, ruling the entire science, and around which the particular ideas group naturally and without effort. Under this head the best manuals disclose grave defects. The greater part of authors do not ascend to the first principles of the moral order; they pause at secondary and derived principles which do not satisfactorily account for anything. Hence it is impossible for them to seize on the true filiation of ideas: they can perceive only imperfectly the unity of the order whose laws they explain.

"We have attempted to correct these defects by starting from more elevated, and what appear to us more philosophical principles. It is for the learned public to decide to what degree we have succeeded.

"Perhaps some may find our mode of proceeding too elevated and far too metaphysical for a course destined for young persons. But to this reproach it is not difficult to reply. We have long since conceived that without profound metaphysics philosophy is impossible; there may be ingenious conceptions, analyses more or less solid, but never can the true reason of things be found. We must therefore select: we must have true *philosophy*, or not speak of it at all. We believe moreover there is always a way of conveying to the young, even those of mediocre talents, ideas of high and profound metaphysics; these ideas are the common patrimony of all intellects, they are present to every spirit, and we think that with method they may be pointed out and rendered intelligible to all—with this difference doubtless, that some will attain more others less, according to their capacities and the degree of attention expended on it.

"Again, we think that the master's mission is not merely to teach his pupils the elements of the science which he represents; it seems to us that it should be his principal aim to develop and elevate their faculties. Now nothing is more suitable to this end than to initiate them into the grand views of christian metaphysics."

We shall not apologize for this long extract. We should have detracted from its genuine value had we attempted to curtail it.

The author next proceeds to notice the distinction which the educational system of the day (adopted even in his own university) has drawn between *le droit naturel*, and *la morale*. And while he admits that it may be very advantageous for those who are entering on the study of law, that certain general principles of the moral order should

be as it were culled from the mass, and treated of in a more special and exclusive manner; at the same time he would fain impress us with a recollection that as those very principles are part of the moral law, and derive from it all their force, their special study must ever be subordinate on the general study of morals. Hence he infers very justly that the science of right must ever be a sort of dependant on that of morals. Further on we shall recur to this subject, and shall endeavour to point out the differences between the Philosophy of Right and Moral Philosophy, and the mutual relations which render them cognate sciences.

The *Introduction*, which is a substantial part of the treatise, commences with establishing the general notion of Moral Science, and inferring this from the etymology of the term, *Ethics*, it defines it to be in general the science which treats of morals, that is of moral actions. Now, a just and philosophical notion of any science must embrace the fundamental principle which determines it and governs all its parts. Such fundamental principle in *Ethics* (for so we shall for brevity sake denominate the science in future) must be the first and highest rule which determines the morality of actions. This rule is *le Bien*. *Le Bien in se* is something absolute, necessary, unchangeable, eternal. This is why *Ethics* finds a place in the circle of the sciences, for, properly speaking, the object of all philosophy is neither more nor less than universal ideas, which are necessary, absolute, unchangeable, eternal. Doubtless philosophy does not content itself with the study of absolute ideas, merely considered in themselves; it investigates their relations with things, with man, the world. But even thus in its study of relative ideas, Philosophy has for its guide the Absolute: this is at the same time the port whence it departs on its outward-bound voyage, and the haven whither it conveys the treasures amassed in its wanderings in stranger climes.

Now, one important corollary follows from this. Necessary and absolute ideas are the divine idea itself, presenting itself under different aspects. Hence, in all strictness, all the parts of philosophy tend directly to God. He is the commencement, the middle, and the end of all philosophy; and a philosophy which does not betake itself on its road, starting with the idea of God, or does not refer all its researches to Him, is *une philosophie manquée*. Accordingly

Moral Philosophy, as it is treated by a vast number of writers scarce deserves the name of a science. Separated from God, and so from the central point of absolute ideas, it must of necessity take a lowly place amongst the empirical sciences, and so proclaims its incapacity of resolving any one of the great problems of the moral order.

Now *Good* (*Bonum*) is the object of Ethics: that is, considered in its relations to man's will which it guides and influences. Man conforming himself to this rule in his actions, perfects himself and becomes *good*: departing from it he deteriorates and becomes evil. And as the freely acquired possession of the Supreme Good is man's perfect happiness, so its free loss constitutes his perfect misery. In this way *Good*, considered under its several relations with the will of man, is the complete object of Moral Science.

Passing to the consideration of the *end* which Ethics has in view, the author remarks that this end cannot be identical with that of religion, namely, the practical one of regulating the actions of men. First, because every science is theoretical, not practical—it addresses itself to the understanding and not to the will: secondly, because, while in pagan times on philosophy devolved that practical teaching which the existing religious system could not perform, now we have a religion whose proper function it is to instruct men in the discharge of all their duties. Hence there does not now exist the same reason for entrusting to Ethics more than its proper province, as when Socrates laid the first foundations of moral science amongst the Athenians. Neither can the end of Ethics be the discovery of the precepts of the moral order; such a statement involves the leading error of Rationalism “that human reason can and ought to discover by its own unaided powers all truth, and especially all moral and religious truth.” The true end of Ethics is to acquire the *science* of the moral order; to set forth the true theory of the relations which constitute this order, and to refute the erroneous theories which have been proposed. Moral Philosophy is then the *science of the moral order*. Hence we may easily deduce its definition. The great principle of the moral order is *good*, considered in its relations with man's will: Moral Philosophy is then the science of good considered as the ruling power of man's will, and as conducting him to that happiness which is his end (*la science du Bien gouvernant le libre arbitre créé, et le conduisant à sa fin ou au bon*

heur). The fundamental truths which such a science involves are on the one hand, the existence of a personal God* who has freely created this world which He governs by His Providence ; on the other hand, with regard to man, his liberty, personality, and immortality ; the denial of any one of those truths will draw with it the necessary ruin of the moral order.

Moral philosophy is, then, connected with other branches of Philosophy. The *good* which governs the created free will is identical with God : hence we have a connection between Ethics and Natural Theology on the one hand, and Psychology on the other. A profound knowledge of both those branches is requisite to an accurate system of Ethics ; but with this difference, that psychology, the science of the human soul only, of its properties—of a contingent, changeable, created being—cannot be the true basis of Moral Philosophy. Natural Theology which presents to us those absolute and necessary ideas of God that can be the only foundation of Ethics, is the true source whence Moral Philosophy is derived.

The author proceeds to point out the difference between Moral Theology and Ethics ; a difference which is identical with that which exists between the science of revealed Theology and Philosophy. Passing on to consider the dignity and importance of Moral Philosophy, after observing how this necessarily flows from the fact of the moral order being the means of acquiring our supreme happiness, he continues thus :—

“ Moral Philosophy derives a new importance from the actual state of men's minds. For about a century, the moral order has been radically convulsed all over Europe : the most sacred principles have been transformed, disfigured, corrupted. What has the dominant philosophy contributed towards remedying this deplorable

* Let no one be shocked at hearing M. Laforet speak of a *personal* God. The term has been used of late by Catholic philosophers in order to mark more definitely the complete distinction which separates the Divine Nature from the world, in opposition to the *impersonal* God of the Pantheists, who, being identical with the world, could not impose obligation on man, because not distinguishable from himself. Hence the term *Personal* as applied to God in this sense, is not taken in its theological or even philosophical signification : but in a purely technical meaning.

state of things? Absolutely nothing. Child of the false and frivolous philosophy of the eighteenth century, contemporary rationalism has but rendered it still more useless. Even the more serious and honest rationalists have themselves deformed some of the fundamental truths of the moral order; and are incapable of defending those few remaining principles which they are anxious to retain, because they have not a basis on which to rest their defence, or rather what they have retained they preserve despite their own principles. It is then of the last importance to endeavour to restore, by a scientific method, to 'those sacred principles which are the foundation of all morality their real character, and to re-establish them on an immovable basis. Such is, in our day, the mission of a good Moral Philosophy.'—pp. 11-12.

Finally, as to the division of Moral Philosophy, it may be distributed into general or theoretical, and special or practical. The former will examine and establish the general relations of *Good* with created free-will: the latter will apply such general principles to the several conditions and circumstances in which man may be found. It is plain that this latter part is but an application and corollary of the former.

Such is M. Laforet's *Introduction* to Moral Philosophy. It is not merely an Introduction: it might well have been called the *Foundation*. We have wished to give its substance at length, in order that our readers may have no difficulty in understanding the remaining portion of the system. It is a noble, elevated view of the nature of moral science, put forward as clearly as the abstruseness of the subject would permit, and connected together by a chain of systematic reasoning. It could not fail to produce, when developed, a closely united system of moral science. But, withal, there is much within it from which we must dissent. However, we shall reserve our remarks until we have spoken of the system itself, to which we now proceed.

The first part treats of *general or theoretical ethics*. In the first chapter the notion of *good* (*ly bonum* as St. Thomas would have said) in itself is set forth with much vigour and closeness of reasoning, and in language scarcely, if at all removed from eloquence. Good is shown to be an idea cognate with Truth, universal, unchangeable, eternal, independent of all succession of races or variations of climate. Now this absolute and unchangeable idea must reside in the Absolute and Unchangeable, that is in God:

"sont quelque chose de Dieu, ou plutôt sont Dieu même."* As however, truth has reference to the understanding, and good to the will; so when we say that God is the absolute good, we have in view, the absolute and necessary Will of God by which He eternally loves Himself. Good in itself is then God inasmuch as He loves and wills Himself with a necessary and essential Will. This necessary and *absolute* Will of God must be distinguished from His *relative* will; the former *wills* His own divine nature and infinite perfections, the latter *wills* everything *really* distinct from God. The former is necessary, the latter free. With the former, it is that (ly) *Good in se* is identified; it is then the *absolute* Will of God which is the foundation of the moral order.

* These words M. Laforet so quotes from Bossuet (*De la connaissance de Dieu et de soi-même*, ch. iv. § 5,) as to appropriate them, as well as others previously quoted, as the expression of his own views. In the previous part of the quotation there occur those remarkable words; "C'est donc en lui, *d'une certaine manière qui m'est incompréhensible*, c'est en lui dis-je, que je vois ces vérités éternelles; et les voir, c'est me tourner à celui, qui est immuablement toute vérité, et recevoir ses lumières." M. Laforet admits that the authenticity of the words we have printed in Italics is not unquestioned; but at all events, he quotes them as embodying his own views. Now, it would seem to us, that there are many objections to introducing such a theory, as that insinuated in the whole passage, particularly in the italicized part of it, as a fundamental principle in establishing the basis of a solid system of Moral Philosophy. We know this theory has been adopted and defended by able men, that St. Augustine has been put forward as its principal patron;—nay for ourselves, we may add, that we must ever speak of it tenderly, for it comes to us clothed with all but paternal authority:—but we know also that able men have denounced it both as unphilosophical and irreligious; and we think under these circumstances, it were an unsuitable basis on which to build up *Ethical science*. It were just as commendable to found the metaphysical demonstration of the existence of God on the hypothesis of the simplicity of material elements. Aristotle has defined τὸ δ' ἐπιστητὸν καὶ ἐπιστήμη διαφέρει τοῦ δοξαστοῦ καὶ δόξης, ὅτι ἡ μὲν ἐπιστήμη καθόλου καὶ δι' ἀναγκαῖον, τὸ δ' ἀναγκαῖον, οὐκ ἐνδέχεται ἄλλως εἶχειν,...ἡ δὲ δόξα ἀβέβαιον (*Analyt. post. I. 33.*) The great majority of scholars have adhered to this rule. It would be, in our opinion very unwise to depart from it; particularly in the actual condition of all merely rational science, and treating of so important a subject as Ethics.

Good, thus explained, is the rule of created will; for every faculty has a rule conformable to its nature, this rule is called its law.

"This truth which we enunciate is evident; it is practically accepted by all men. A very little attention will be sufficient to enable us to understand this. Whence comes it that every day of your lives, within the secret recesses of your own consciences, you blame each free act of yours which has not been performed in conformity with what you consider Good? Whence comes it that every man,—no matter what are his principles otherwise,—acts, spontaneously and unreflectingly, in the same way, according to the same rule,—nay oftentimes despite some contrary suggestion, the offspring of a depraved will? Whence come those things, unless from the fact that an irresistible evidence constrains us to recognize Good as the rule of the will; and that when our will goes aside from this rule it fails in its duty and deserves blame?"—p. 21.

Doubtless men differ seriously in particular cases as to what is *hic et nunc* good: many deceive themselves sadly, but

"This is not the question. It is enough, that all have the idea of Good (*τοῦ Boni*) and regard the will as *obliged* to conform itself to that which seems to it good. Forthwith it is clear that Good is the rule of the will.....

"We may now enquire the reason of this fact whose evidence is so apparent, and we may ask why is Good the rule of the created will? This is our answer to this question. Every creature is made according to the order which exists in God, and ought, inasmuch as it possesses perfection, to represent in some degree the divine perfections. God is necessarily the model of the created universe, He could not have looked for a model but to Himself, to His divine nature; for without Himself there was nothing. God then must have been the model of the created spirit, and He must have been so in an especial manner, for it is the creature which resembles him most nearly; our soul has been made to the image and likeness of God. (*Ἀγαθὸς ἦν ἁγαθὴ δὲ οὐδεὶς περὶ οὐδενὸς οὐδέποτε ἐγγίγνεται φθόνος* τούτου δ' ἐκτός ὡν πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα γενέσθαι ἐβουλήθη παραπλήσια ἑαυτῷ. *Plat. Timæ. 29.*) Thus the created understanding would have for its rule the divine understanding, and the created will the divine will. But, as on the one hand the divine understanding is identified with Truth *in se*, it follows, that our understanding has for its rule Truth; and as on the other hand the absolute will of God is identified with Good *in se*, it also follows, that our will has for its rule Good. This is, to our mind, the final reason why Good is necessarily the law of our created will."—p. 22.

Such is, as it would be technically described amongst Continental writers, M. Laforet's theory on the *origin of moral obligation*. But this theory has to be developed. How does Good regulate the will? In what way does the relation between Good and the created will come to exist, (comment le Bien se mette *en rapport, en contact*, avec la volonté,) so that the former will rule and direct the latter in all its movements? How, in a word, comes the moral law to exist? Now, since Good is identified with the absolute Will of God, all these questions come to mean, "how does the absolute will of God become the law of our will?" For the purpose of resolving this question, M. Laforet goes into an examination of three general points:

1. God inasmuch as He knows and loves Himself.

2. God inasmuch as He conceives as *possible* beings distinct from Himself.

3. God *realizing* the plan of the World by creation.

Our limits will not allow us to follow this examination in detail; and we the more willingly abstain from doing so, because the matter is not new, but the usual doctrine of the Scholastics on the eternal and necessary character of the *possibilia*. Much freshness is imparted to it by the clear and graceful style in which it is told; but the theory itself is identical with that taught by Dmowski and Ubaghs. There is, however, one position which we must advert to for its influence on the whole system: it occurs towards the close of the third point indicated above.

All creatures, and their mutual relations are *good*, because, inasmuch as they are conformable to the Divine Will: because they are conformable to that *possible* order of creatures which God loved with His absolute Will. Hence the human will so far conforms to its rule, as it observes the order established by God. It has for its rule *Good*, which is the absolute Will of God. By this absolute Will, God loves all possible beings, and their mutual relations as imitative reflections of His own infinite perfections. The world which God *freely* created by His Relative Will, must be conformable to the possible world loved absolutely by God. Hence the created will, in order to be conformable to its rule—Good, the absolute Will of God—must observe the order *actually* established or *realized*, by the relative will of God, because such actual or relative order is perfectly conformable with the possible

and absolute order. Such is the way in which the actual order becomes the object of man's observance, the *real* rule, so to speak, of his actions. But *how* does this rule, whether absolute or real, direct man? how is it for him a law?

"Here (with regard to man's free-will) God puts on a new character, He assumes a tone really imperative, He ordains, He commands in the strict sense of the word. Revealing Himself to the will as the absolute Good, He prescribes, that man conform himself to it (and he does so by his observance of the established order), promising him at the same time to reward him if he obey, and threatening him with punishment if he disobey."—pp. 29-30.

One element only is wanting to the completion of this chain of reasoning. It is insinuated in this question:—

Is the creature morally bound to observe the precept given to it by God?

Such an obligation must be conceived as preceding, *ordine naturæ*, the divine command; it could not logically be subsequent or concomitant to it. But the author had anticipated this question by remarking, (page 28).

"It is unnecessary to observe, that creatures, being *effects* of God, deriving from God everything which they have, are in a state of the most perfect dependance in His regard: consequently they are bound (according to their nature?) to conform themselves in everything to the order which He has traced out. *By virtue of creation, God is invested with a supreme and unlimited right over all finite beings.*"*

* Will this answer completely satisfy the proposed question? might one still ask: "right cannot exist in one being without a corresponding obligation on the part of another; nay it is this very obligation which is conceived as the generative principle of right. Hence God's right to command presupposes an already existing obligation on the part of the creature to obey. Whence comes this obligation?"

Without attempting to decide this knotty point, we shall endeavour to place clearly before our readers the difference between the theory of M. Laforet, and that insinuated in the question just now proposed. And to do so with accuracy, we shall distinguish, with all catholic theologians and philosophers, certain *instantia rationis*, or *signi* in eternity. According to M. Laforet, we should distinguish, with regard to the *production*, so to speak, of the moral law,

1. The instant when God *conceives* the *possibilia*, and the necessary order of their mutual relations.

Good, then, thus imposed as a rule on the human will, is the moral law,—supreme type and model of all other laws. This first law is a precept, just general, and permanent, obliging every created will, under the sanction of rewards and punishments. Considered in its concrete reality, it may be defined “Good presenting itself to the created will, commanding it with sovereign authority to conform itself to it (Good), and claiming for itself an entire obedience.” This law is called *moral*, because first, it is freely observed, in contradistinction to physical and purely intellectual laws: secondly, because the object of this law is to regulate *mores* (that is, those habits of men which arise from a repetition of free acts) and consequently those free

2. The instant when God loves with His *absolute* Will those possible beings and the necessary order of their relations.

3. The instant when God wills to realize this order by creation.

4. The right to govern man acquired by the act of creation, and consequent obligation to obey, produced as it were by creation in man.

5. The Divine law commanding man to observe the order of the world.

According to the view insinuated in the question contained in the early part of this note, the *right of creation* enumerated in the fourth place here cannot be the first and primary origin of obligation, because prior to this right there must have existed (in *ordine nature*) an obligation on the part of man to respect it, for the logical conception of right in one being, necessarily involves a corresponding duty in others. Prior then to this *right of creation* there existed for men a rule of action *obliging* them to respect it. Nay, it might be contended that such an obligatory rule must be conceived as preceding every act of God, as well necessary as free. Because the reason *why* such an act can bind men with a moral obligation must be something anterior to it, determining that a human action conformable to such divine act is good, and an action not conformable is bad. Otherwise the same question will recur: *Why must men recognize in this Divine act a rule of their wills?*

These remarks we have made rather to place as briefly as we could before our readers the real nature of the question involved in any theory on the *Principle of obligation*, than to offer any criticisms on M. Laforet's theory. The subject is too great and important to be treated of in an aside way: and we have not aimed in this paper to sketch our own system of moral Philosophy, if any such we have; but to introduce to our readers the able work of M. Laforet on the subject.

acts themselves. Thus is established not only the *existence*, but the *manner* of the existence of the moral law.

We now proceed to ascertain the nature and characters of the moral law.

1. It is peculiar to man and conformable to his nature.—For it is a precept commanding him to maintain the order of those relations which his intelligence knows to exist between God and the world, and between the beings which compose the world mutually: none but a free being is capable of receiving a precept, therefore the law is peculiar to man alone.

2. This law is objective, distinct, and independent of the human soul.—For it is in reality the absolute Good. Now this is necessary, unchangeable, eternal; therefore it cannot be identified with our soul which is contingent, created, changeable. Consequently any system which identifies the moral law with the soul must be false.

3. This law is necessary.—Not as if we should say, that the absolute Good were necessary; this would be tautology; but that under its aspect of *law* it is necessary. God *necessarily* conceived from all eternity certain beings as possible: He also necessarily conceived the relations which mutually connected those beings, because inherent in their nature. He loves and wills, with equal necessity, both those possible beings and their natural relations. Consequently, when God created a free being, He necessarily commanded him to observe the order of these relations. He could not have abstained from doing so without denying His own nature. There are then some things which are necessarily good; their moral goodness antecedes the free action of God's Will. Man is necessarily obliged to conform himself to those things; such conformity is good of itself, while any dif-formity will be bad of itself.

4. The moral law is unchangeable.—The natural relations of things (whose necessary order the moral law commands man to maintain) cannot be other than they are; for they flow from the intrinsic and necessary nature of the possible beings. Since then these relations cannot change, neither can the law, which necessarily expresses them and prescribes their observance, change. Hence,

(a) The moral law can never be abrogated.

(β) God Himself cannot dispense in its observance, so as to cause that which is contrary to it to cease to be evil.

Yet the schoolmen and scriptural commentators speak of God's dispensing even in the natural law? There are two sorts of change with regard to a law. One *intrinsic* and *absolute*, when the object remaining the same, the obligation which the law imposed with regard to that object ceases; as if blasphemy, continuing just what it is, should cease to be forbidden by the law. The other change is *extrinsic* and *relative*, when certain things which fall within the province of the law, undergo a change which alters their relations with other things, and so modifies their relation to the law. The former change is the only one which affects the law itself; it is it we have in mind, when we say the moral law can undergo no change.

5. The moral law is universal.—There are three sorts of universality: (1) universality of place, (2) universality of time, (3) universality with regard to the actions which the law governs. Now as to the former two species of universality, it is plain that the moral law is universal; for through all time and in all place, the necessary moral order must be commanded as it is known and willed by God. But also the moral law is universal as to all human actions, in this sense, that man must always act conformably to the moral order, to reason, to God's will. There are, no doubt, actions *per se indifferent*, that is, which may be performed or omitted according to man's option; but if they are performed, they must be performed *well*, that is, at least for an end conformable to the dignity of human nature, otherwise man violates the necessary moral order.

6. The moral law is self-evident.—There are people who are ignorant of some of the precepts of the moral law. There are also people who are ignorant of most simple mathematical truths. Such people have not *subjective* evidence on these matters; that is, their proofs have not been seized upon by their minds. When we say that the moral law is *self-evident*, we mean that it has objective evidence, that is, that it carries with itself convincing arguments independent of every other source. These arguments are (1) ontological, founded on the fact of the moral law being a necessary law springing necessarily from the necessary order of things: (2) psychological, because when the general principles of the moral law,—*steal not, give unto every-one what is his due, honour thy parents*, etc. (presupposing that the mind understands the terms and the ideas

which they express)—are proposed to the mind, we see their truth immediately, perceiving instantly that the predicate necessarily agrees with the subject.

7. The moral law is autonomous.—For it is the absolute good, manifesting itself to man, and necessarily commanding him to conform himself to itself. Hence it is its own legislator, its own sovereign authority in the strictest sense of the word. Everything which it commands is equally good; everything which it forbids is equally evil. No positive law can possess this quality; because being free, it requires another being to give it existence, to make it a law.

8. The moral law is eternal.—For it is necessary, unchangeable, universal, absolute, it is identical with the absolute good; as this could not have been created it must have been eternal. A difficulty presents itself. Man was created in time; without him we cannot understand the existence of a law. True. But neither can we conceive God actually a Creator, without the existence of creatures. A distinction, familiar to all who are even slightly acquainted with the metaphysics of Catholic authors, will dissipate this apparent difficulty. The will of God creating the world, and consequently commanding the observance of the moral order (this command being the moral law) is eternal: the *term* (object) of this will exists in time. This is the origin of the distinction made by St. Thomas and the scholastics between the eternal law and the natural law.

9. The moral law is not distinguishable from God Himself.—For it is the absolute good, that is God, commanding man to observe the intrinsic order of things.

Corollaries.—Therefore those systems are false which (*a*) consider the moral law as something separate from God, and independent of Him; or (*b*) which while they regard the moral law as something essentially dependant on God, view it nevertheless as something distinct from Him, and possessing a certain undefinable abstract reality.

Hence the Moral Law has for its remote source God, inasmuch as He loves His own divine nature necessarily and absolutely: its proximate source is the natural necessary relations flowing from the metaphysical essences of things.

This moral law being the first and supreme obligatory rule of action imposed on man, is the foundation and model

of all positive laws. Positive laws are those which do not flow immediately and necessarily from the natural relations of things, but emanate from the free will of the legislator. They are called positive, as it were antithetically to the natural (or moral) law; because they are something *superadditum* and *appositum naturæ*, while this latter flows from the necessary will of God commanding the observance of the natural order of things.* There are two classes of positive laws, divine and human. It is manifest, that any ordinance or *soi-disant* law contravening the prescriptions of the moral law ceases *ipso facto* to be a law.

We have purposely devoted much space to this synopsis of the second chapter: because it contains the real system of the author. All which follows is but the developement of this system, or a logical consequence of it. We may then pass the remaining portion of the work more rapidly in review, than we could have justly done hitherto.

In the third chapter M. Laforet enters on an examination of the false systems, which have been propounded by various authors concerning the moral law. He distinguishes five principal systems. We cannot enter into the detail of this most interesting subject without encroaching

* Not long since we had occasion to hear some persons discussing the nature of the *natural law*. One of the parties very earnestly contended that the obligation of the natural law cannot be attributable to any act of God's will, inasmuch as in this case, being a *jussum superioris* it would be a *positive* law! None of his companions could set him right. For although from the circumstances of their position, they ought all to have been well informed on those subjects; they were all in reality so grossly ignorant, as to pain, by their perpetual mistakes, any one even slightly acquainted with the matter.

A friend of ours, a couple of weeks ago, met an M. A. of one of our universities, a really well informed man on most subjects. In the course of the conversation this gentleman asked him what he had been reading lately? our friend answered "Kant's criticism of practical reason." The other not being acquainted with it, asked what it was about, and was informed that it was Kant's Moral Philosophy. "That is right," said he, "you do well to keep up your acquaintance with these matters. But you should read our authors, — Paley, Mackintosh, Brown. Now were I you, I would get up Tupper's proverbial Philosophy, if it were but for the sake of introducing contrasts into my conversation on the subject"!!

too much on our space. We must content ourselves with a mere outline. At the same time we cannot too earnestly call our readers' attention to the importance of this subject, which must always occupy a chief place in every well digested treatise of Moral Philosophy. We fear that it is a matter with which mere students are very slightly acquainted; nay we are sadly assured, that our own students have not as yet been able to form with it even a slight acquaintance.

(a) The first false system is the egotistical, based on utilitarianism or the morality of self-interest. It might be formulized thus: "an action is good because it is useful." Hence the same line of conduct will be good or evil according as it brings with it, or is destitute of temporal advantages. The chief supporters of this system in modern times have been Hobbes, Helvetius, Volney, Destutt-Tracy, and Bentham. It is based on the psychological and ideological systems of Locke and Condillac.

(b) The second system is *the sentimental*. Its principal supporters have been members of the Scotch and English schools. Richard Cumberland was the first who, with a view to refute the theory of Hobbes, endeavoured to construct a moral system on the basis of sentiment. The celebrated Lord Shaftesbury followed in the same path; he first introduced the term, moral sense. But, Francis Hutcheson, an Irishman, and an élève of Trinity College, Dublin, and afterwards professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow, has the merit—if merit it be—of having systematized this doctrine. It places the moral rule of our actions in our feelings of benevolence and tenderness for others. Adam Smith, the political economist, has developed this doctrine. He places the principle of morality in sympathy; its leading law may be formulized thus: "so act that other men may sympathize with thee."

(c) The rationalist system, or abstract morality.

1. System of Kant.

Kant is one of those names which inspire a sort of terror amongst a certain class of philosophers. They are good men, sincerely religious, animated with the best views; but either from their smallness of mental power, or their unacquaintance with the real matters in question, the deep-sea fisheries of metaphysics, they are unable to measure the height and breadth of the great philosopher of

Königsberg. To their elf-like vision his proportions are such and of the same kind as those of Virgil's Rumour. Kant has done great good service in moral philosophy as well as elsewhere; he has shaken sensist philosophy to pieces. He has committed grave mistakes. But these should not cause us to forget his good deeds. M. Laforet pays a high tribute to his merit, but dismisses his system too cursorily. Of the importance of a full and diligent study of Kant, we could not bring a greater proof than that, without an accurate knowledge of it, it will be impossible to understand the French or German—we had almost added Italian—philosophy of the day, particularly its pantheistic tendencies.

II. French Rationalism.

This also, we think, a little too hastily sketched by the author. He sums up M. Cousin's theory in a few lines, formulizing it from his edition of Plato's *Eutyphron* thus: "It is not amongst the dogmas of religion that we must seek the primitive title and origin of the moral truths. They legitimate themselves. They have no need of another authority than that of reason, which perceives and proclaims them." He proceeds then to similarly outline the views of Jouffroy, Saisset, Guizot, S. Simon, and others, in a manner which can scarcely convey to his readers an accurate idea of the actual condition of eclecticism as applied to Moral Philosophy.

(d) The doctrine which derives the moral law from the free will of God.—In this theory an action is good simply because God has willed it so; He might have willed otherwise, and then this same action would have been evil. It is sufficient to state this doctrine to prove its refutation. The author cites as its patrons, Ockham, the celebrated Scholastic, several Protestant theologians, (according to Leibnitz,) the distinguished Swedish jurist, Puffendorf, and Crusius; and he declaims very justly against certain Catholic writers of our day, who, ignorant of the profounder teaching of philosophy and Christian theology, would fain resuscitate this strange theory.

(e) Pantheism compared with the moral law.—Here again we must differ with the author. We do not think he has at all done justice to the subject. The relations between Pantheism and Moral Philosophy, and the philosophy of Right, have been gradually extending themselves. The Hegelian theory has become not only the

foundation of all instruction in many parts of Germany, but has even been made the basis of civil and criminal codes. Hence an extensive course of Ethics would be wholly incomplete, did it not notice in considerable detail Continental Pantheism, just as the same subject should be fully treated in a similar course of metaphysics. We do not, however, find fault with M. Laforet for anything he has said; we only wish he had said ten times as much.

The fourth chapter treats of Right and Duty. Of this subject we shall speak by and bye. The fifth chapter examines into the condition of Man under the influence of Moral Law, of his understanding, his passions and affections, his free will. The sixth purports to explain the nature and difference of moral good and evil; it discusses the character of virtue, of vice, their effects on the soul, of merit and demerit. All these subjects are treated neatly, accurately, and as fully as the prescribed limits would permit; the author never failing to trace back each point to his own system, and again to draw copious illustrations from this latter.

The seventh chapter enters on a subject familiar to every student of ethics—Sanction. Every law, M. Laforet says, must, in order to secure obedience, have a sanction, that is, punishment and reward attached to its violation, or its observance. The moral law also is attended by this important property; its sanction flows both from the sanctity and the justice of God; this sanction must be complete and perfect, therefore, it involves the reality of another life; this life will be endless, endless also the sanction, endless the reward of good actions—the end to which man tended by his observance of the Moral Law—endless the punishment which will attend the deprivation of his end on which man turns his back when he sins. This latter point, evidently the more difficult, he takes great pains to demonstrate, winding up with the conclusion, “that the Catholic dogma of the eternity of punishment inflicted on the reprobate is a dogma eminently philosophical; and that they who deny it seem to be little worthy of the name of philosophers.” (p. 122.) And so ends the first, or theoretical, part of “*La Philosophie Morale*.”

The second, or practical part, professes to be a general application of the principles already laid down. This application must be general, because ethics is not a science

of casuistry destined to mark the actual limits between good and evil in every vicissitude of circumstances in which man may be placed. What then, is the great leading rule of moral conduct, the general precept of good, of which all other particular precepts are but special applications? It must be contained in this imperative formula, "will what God wills, maintain the order which He has established?" Our business, then, is to determine what this established order is, in order that we may determine how this general precept will particularize itself.

The established order is the order of man's relations. Now those relations are three-fold: (1) with God, (2) with himself, (3) with others. There might be added a fourth class—relations with creatures of an inferior order: but the three just mentioned are of chief importance. The general precept of good applied to this triple order of relations, produces three great classes of *duty*. Man is placed in connexion with his duties by *conscience* and *free will*; hence the consideration of these becomes consequent on the development of man's duties. Finally, there will remain the consideration of the particular effects of the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of these duties, that is, the detailed study of particular virtues and vices. Such is the outline of the second part. Most of its topics are treated at length in all Catholic systematic works on Moral Philosophy. The only novelty which they receive from M. Laforet is, that they are illustrated and deduced from the general principles already established in the first part. We will not then delay on them; but we shall content ourselves with indicating summarily, for the benefit of such of our readers as may not be acquainted with the way in which they are treated by Catholic authors, the heads of the several subjects.

I. The first chapter treats of the duties of Man towards God, or, of Religious Worship.—Worship is two-fold, interior and exterior. Man is bound to render both to God. Hence he is bound to adore Him, to pray to Him, and to love Him. As to external worship, it also is two-fold, private and public,—each form is obligatory. The individual man as well as the social body, or community of men, is bound to worship God with external ceremonies and solemn rites.

II. The second chapter inquires into the duties of Man towards himself.—There is no absurdity in such an in-

quiry. Man is not the author and principle of such duties ; they derive from the moral law, which obliges him to respect in his own person, in his body and soul, the order of the relations established by God. These duties may be classed into (a) those relative to the understanding, determining the order, manner and extent of our cognitions ; (b) those relative to the will, including the direction and restraint of our passions ; (c) those relative to the body and its life, involving the obligation of preserving this life, and prohibiting suicide.

III. Next come the duties of Man towards his fellows. —These duties are three-fold, according to man's triple relation to (1) his family, (2) the state, (3) to individual stranger men. (a) Hence we must commence with an examination of the nature of *marriage* the foundation and origin of the domestic society : it is the legitimate union of man and woman, implying the obligation of living in one and the same society. It is the union of one with one. Hence it equally excludes polyandry and polygamy. It is of its own nature indissoluble ; hence it essentially excludes divorce ; and the civil power can no more legitimate divorce than it can theft.

To the consideration of marriage naturally succeeds (b) the consideration of the rights and duties of parents with regard to their children. Parental authority, M. Laforet regards as a gift, emanating directly from God ; one of its inalienable duties and rights is the good education of the children. Closely connected to this subject is that of (c) the duties of children towards their parents.

2. The second branch of our social relations, springs from the fact of our being members of civil society. For this society we have a natural fitness and tendency. The investigation of our duties under this head involves (a) that civil society is a law of human nature, (b) that consequently there must exist a civil power which will govern such society, (c) that this power comes from God. Hence, we pass to examine (d) how this power comes into the hands of the chief authority in the state. (e) The doctrine taught by Hobbes and Rousseau, as to the natural condition of man must be rejected, because contrary to his social destiny. (f) We next consider the duties and rights of the chief civil power with regard to its subjects, and (g) vice versâ, the duties and rights of the latter. This leads to an examination of the right of subjects to

resist unjust laws and ordinances. The author treats this delicate question very briefly but ably; and in reply to it, he lays down substantially the doctrine which facts have incorporated with the constitutions of England and Belgium. (h) He thence passes to an inquiry into the obligation of every citizen to contribute to the well-being and moral perfection of his country. Finally, he just touches (k) the relations of states with each other.

IV. The third class of our duties towards our fellows is investigated in the fourth chapter. They include: (A) *justice*, which involves—

(1) Respect for the lives of others; although such respect does not detract from (a) the right of legitimate defence. However it distinctly forbids (b) duelling.

(2) Respect for the property of others.*

These however, are negative duties, we have also (B) positive duties, involving—

(1) Mutual love, (2) almsgiving, both spiritual and corporal.

V. Man is placed in immediate relation with the particular prescriptions of the moral law by his conscience, and his free will. Conscience is considered as a practical judgment which decides, in a particular case, what is good or evil, and consequently what we ought to do or avoid, or what we ought to have done or avoided. Hence, conscience is the rule of our acts, and is the measure of their morality. It may be considered either subjectively or objectively. Objectively it is true or erroneous: error is vincible or invincible.† Subjectively, it is certain or

* This leads to a necessarily hurried sketch of the origin and lawfulness of *individual property*, and a defence of such property against the Socialists. We regret extremely that M. Laforet has modelled this part of his treatise on defective types. He has endeavoured to treat social rights and duties together, as parts of the same subject, and this fully as much because the treatises, with which he is familiar, had done so, as in conformity with a certain view he has on the subject. The consequence of this *mélange* is that neither one point nor the other is treated clearly, and that it becomes impossible to trace either rights or duties to their *generative principle*. As well ought Moral Philosophy treat of the nature and attributes of God, as of the origin and characters of the civil power. We shall return to this subject presently.

† The author seems not to have exercised his usual perspicacity

uncertain, "no one can follow lawfully a conscience which is not morally certain, or place an act of whose lawfulness he doubts," (p. 223). Free will is necessary, that an act be moral, that is, meritorious or blameworthy. Free will is "The faculty of acting according to one's own determination, and one's own choice."* The causes which

here. He has quoted from others, the trite division of erroneous conscience into *vincibiliter* and *invincibiliter* erroneous, without ascertaining for himself if this division be real. Now it would seem that with regard to the moral law, there can be no invincible error: for such error would fall upon the first moral principles, or on deductions drawn from them. With regard to the first principles error cannot exist; because those principles are immediately evident. As to the deductions from the principles, either we have drawn them for ourselves, or we have adopted them on the teaching of some one who deserves our confidence. Now, in the former case, we cannot fall into invincible error as to those deductions: for either the conclusion is evident or not. If evident, we cannot have erred at all. If not evident, nothing compels us to assent to it. Hence if we do so assent, we do it willingly, and any error into which we may fall is attributable to ourselves. But if we have learned those deductions through the teachings of others, then it is not to be wondered, that we should fall into error. Because, in these circumstances, the moral Law puts on, with regard to those deductions, the character of a *positive* law, resting finally on the moral repute of our informant. Consequently we may conclude, that, concerning the moral law itself, there is no such thing as invincible error.

* *La faculté d'agir en vertu de sa propre détermination et de son propre choix.* (p. 225.) This definition has been already given (p. 95.) I. part, ch. V. § III. We fear it cannot sustain the test of a rigorous analysis. In the first place it merely declares the spontaneity of our actions, according to the old scholastic notion that *spontaneum est quod fit a principio intrinseco efficiente et determinante*, in opposition to *coactum quod fit a principio extrinseco*. This is the utmost that can follow from the fact of actions being *en vertu de sa propre détermination*. But he speaks of choice? *choice* supposes a power of election, that is an intrinsic power of setting aside some things and preferring others: surely this is a complete notion of liberty? we are of a different opinion. And first because M. Laforet defines liberty to be *the power of acting in virtue of..... one's own choice*. Now here the choice precedes the power of acting; and it is this latter which is said to be free. That is freedom would be predicated immediately and directly of the vital action by which I raise my arm, and not rather of the voluntary act by

influence our actions so as to diminish our free will, nay sometimes to destroy it altogether—are (1) ignorance, (2) constraint, (3) fear, (4) passion.

Finally, in the sixth chapter, M. Laforet treats of virtues and vices hurriedly sketching their nature and chief divisions.

Such is an analysis of M. Laforet's "Philosophie Morale." We have already commended it as an elevated and noble system, well bound together, and methodically arranged, and put forward as lucidly and clearly as the matter would admit. In an age like ours, when the spirit of innovation has seized upon everything, leaving no doctrine untouched, no principle untempted, it is matter of congratulation to see so able a work issue on an important branch of science; still more so, that while it adopts for its basis a deep, and oftentimes abstruse system of metaphysics, it treats things in a form parallel to that of the popular philosophical works of Cousin, Comte, Saisset, &c. But, while we speak thus warmly of the work, there are some reflections which suggest themselves to us. We shall state them very briefly.

1. We shall first remark on that very system of metaphysics which M. Laforet places as the basis of his moral system. We do not refer to the Scholastic theory of the eternal existence of the *possibilia* in the mind of God, and the intrinsically necessary order of their mutual rela-

which I determine to exercise this vital operation. Secondly, the choice according to which we act may be free or not. If the latter, neither can the act placed in consequence (*en vertu*) of it pretend to freedom. If the choice is free, then to it and not the faculty of acting in conformity with it, can freedom be attributed. Thirdly, freedom necessarily involves (at least in creatures) the power of so willing, as that we might at the same time, if we so chose, abstain from willing, or will the contrary. Now, no such power is reserved in the definition: nay it would seem to be positively excluded by the words *en vertu*. This definition then would seem (1) not to include certain essential conditions without which we cannot conceive freedom; (2) freedom, according to it, would really exist in some of the *præ-requisita ad agendum*, and not in the *actus secundus* itself; (3) it predicates freedom directly and immediately of the *actus imperati*, and not of the *actus elicit* only; (4) finally, it rather defines those actions which are spontaneous, than those which are free.

tions. Of this theory we have nothing to say at present, save that it offers an intelligible ground on which to rest the proofs of the existence of the Moral Law. But we mean the more ideal and subtle conceptions of the identity of God with the Absolute Good, and of the deduction of moral obligation from God so conceived;—of the dependence of Good on the Divine Will, and of the distinction, as explained by the author, and with reference to the origin of the Moral Law, between the Absolute and the Relative Will of God. Those views are too subtle, even if correct, too personal, too much of an intellectually-æsthetic character (if one may so speak,) to render it advisable that a moral theory should be based upon them. He who would aim at discovering a scientific basis for a system of ethics, must remember, that he is about constructing the most popular and universal of sciences; for there is no man who is not subject to its influence, no action which is not controlled by its laws. It is impossible, then, that the basis of such a science can be lost in the haze of a recondite and subtle collection of theorems which are conceived to have an *a priori* existence. It was against such a system of metaphysics that Kant so inexorably warred, contending with so much truth against the possibility of its ever forming the groundwork of real knowledge.

2. Even as we have sketched the "*Philosophie Morale*," it must have appeared a subtle and complicated system. Yet we venture to believe that the system, as it exists in the original work, is much more complicated and traced out much more subtly. We have carefully avoided all detail which could embarrass the clear comprehension of the outline, and was not necessary to the understanding of any fundamental principle. We do not intend any discourtesy either to M. Laforet or our readers, when we express an opinion that some of the arguments would have been too fine-spun and far-drawn for the comprehensions of some at least amongst the latter.

3. The doctrine of M. Laforet, on the object of Moral Philosophy, seems open to grave reprehension. Is it correct to say that

"This object cannot, like that of religion, be a practical one; to regulate the morals of man, and to direct him in his practical life. For Moral Philosophy is a science, and the object of every science is necessarily *theoretical*, and *speculative* science addresses itself to the understanding and not to the will."

Is it not rather the first function of ethics, of Moral Philosophy, to address itself to the direction of man's will, of his free actions? Is there not an art of LIVING WELL, just as much as there is one of shoemaking, of carpentering, of the engineer, mason, bricklayer? and if there be such an art, must it not have rules? nay, has not the author told us some of those rules? And if there are rules by whose guidance we may live well, is there not a science which undertakes to enumerate them accurately, to strengthen them with apposite reasons, to demonstrate them, to search out their first principles, to connect them into one body worthy of being called a science, according to Aristotle's definition already quoted, (p. 411, note.) because a universal discipline arising from necessary principles? And is not this science a practical one, which does not rest contented in the mere speculative contemplation of good, but proposes it to the will as necessarily to be performed?

Again one might ask, "has the Moral Law been abrogated by the Christian dispensation?" The author will at once answer in the negative, because it is a necessary law. One might extend his inquiry, and ask if it has been specially revealed as part of the Christian dispensation? Should an affirmative answer be returned, it would be, at best, only a very peculiar and private opinion. But the science of Moral Theology is, for fully two-thirds of its extent, occupied with questions arising from no positive Divine or human law, and consequently decidable by the natural law alone. Now, will the author say that Moral Theology is not a practical science,—that the discipline which is the practical guide in the salvation of souls for the ministers of religion, addresses itself solely to the understanding, and puts aside the will, is purely theoretical and speculative? Now, Ethics and Moral Theology are identical sciences, or almost identical, in those matters which arise out of the Natural Law. Both decide on principles of reason, the only difference being that Moral Theology brings in the aid of revelation sometimes to decide doubtful cases, and is able to adventure itself on the wide sea of casuistry, which Moral Philosophy is obliged in a great measure to avoid.

In fact there is no generic difference between the moral knowledge of two men, one of whom is taught by religion, the other by reason, not to steal, because God will visit

theft with severe punishment hereafter. Each knows practically his duty, although from a different source; that knowledge surely is practical which influences my *πραξις*, just as much as practical is my knowledge of the *burning power of fire, if it induce me to abstain from thrusting my hand in.*

Hence we cannot agree with M. Laforet when he says that ethics must now yield to religious teaching functions, which it might have assumed in the days of heathenism. Ethics are of the same use now as ever. True there is *another source of moral information now, but that has not dried up the other.* We have seen how each teaches, in a great measure, the same truths, they run parallel, and as parallel lines can never cross each other, so neither can those sciences. Man may learn his duty in one or in the *other, so far as they are co-extensive, for religion teaches much, on which ethics must be silent. But this latter science, so far as it goes, "teaches man the laws which serve to regulate his conduct" just as much as religion.* Therefore, so far the end of ethics is not different from that of religion.

4. Nor is M. Laforet quite correct when he cites as an error of rationalist philosophers the opinion that the object of ethics is "the discovery of the rules and precepts of the moral order." Now, F. Solimani, the actual professor of Moral Philosophy in the Roman College, and one of the ablest writers on the subject in Europe, *has never, that we have heard, been suspected of rationalism.* His work on Ethics is lying open before us. The FIRST sentence in the very FIRST page is so:

"Ethica est scientia morum, idest scientia, quæ normas inquirat, ad quas, dum homo suas exigit actiones, bonos sibi comparat mores. Quare duplex est Ethicæ munus. Primo enim oportet ut Ethica inveniat ac certo quodam ordine hominis proponat præcipuas bene agendi regulas. Deinde necesse est, ut INVENTAS regulas homini apte accomodet ac quodammodo applicet."

But, perhaps the key to this opinion of M. Laforet is to be found in a passage of the Introduction, (p. 5.) where he says—

"We shall content ourselves with observing that philosophy in general cannot have for its object the discovery of the chief truths of the moral and religious order. These truths were given to man long prior to his being a philoso-

pher. Philosophy is not called upon to destroy the work of nature or of religion; her duty is only to expound it and develope it. For our part we know no other morality than Christian morality; and we would consider ourselves wanting in our duty, not only to religion, but to philosophy itself, if we commenced by casting doubt upon the truth of the moral rules and precepts which have been given to us in the Christian teaching."

We cannot approve this doctrine. We believe that it strikes at the root of all philosophy, that it takes out of the domain of reason what properly belongs to it. No doubt man received the truths of the moral and religious order prior to being a philosopher, but he received also the truths of the ontological and physical orders. If the investigation of the reality of the one class of truths cannot be the province of philosophy, because it would irreligiously seem to cast doubt on the previous teaching; so neither can the investigation of the reality of truths of the other class, for a similar reason. The existence, then, of the moral law, the existence of God, the reality of another life, of this material world, of the very authority which professes to teach us those truths, would be subjective a priori postulates, which cannot be investigated without pulling the whole fabric of truth down about our ears. Man certainly cannot destroy the work of nature, he cannot obliterate the teaching which he has already received; when he starts on his philosophical journey, he cannot render his mind a *tabula rasa*. He must commence where he is: he must go on with the cargo of knowledge, or rubbish, as the case may be, which he has on board. His knowledge becomes philosophy when searching through the storehouse of his mind, he discovers there the last supreme reason of what he knows. But it is not philosophy, it is belief, when he holds on to other teaching than that of his mind and of things themselves. The philosophy which would only develope the Christian morality, that is, morality *quâ* Christian, would be no philosophy, it would be only another form of religious teaching. M. Laforet has, fortunately, not carried out his own principle; otherwise his work, able no doubt as a free exposition of a part of Moral Theology, would have the same claim to be called philosophy, as would the *Symbolik* of Möhler.

5. The definition of Ethics, given by M. Laforet, seems to us quite incorrect, or at best to apply to only a portion

of Moral Philosophy, (as Moral Philosophy is understood by some writers)—the portion which treats de Finibus. The definition is so: "The science of Good governing the created free will, and conducting it to its end, or to happiness." And the author infers this definition by this process of reasoning: *Moral Philosophy is the science of the moral order, now the supreme principle of the moral order* is good considered in its relations with the created free will, therefore, etc. Now, as every science devotes only a small portion (if any) of its speculation to its supreme principle, or to the supreme principle of the real object of its speculations,* so a definition which refers only to that supreme principle, cannot be a definition of the science itself, but only of a part of it. Again, neither can this definition be strictly a definition, even of that portion of the doctrine, which is by some writers included in Moral Philosophy, viz: *de fine hominis*. For as Moral Philosophy is the science of morals, or, (according to M. Laforet) of the moral order; it can only busy itself about that kind of happiness which is exclusively connected with it, viz., the happiness of the other life. And this is invariably what is meant by those writers who treat of man's happiness in their works on ethics. Now the definition which we have on hand, talks of happiness and good, in general; there is nothing added to limit the signification of these terms. Consequently it is applicable rather to Eudæmonology (the general science of happiness) than to that particular branch of Moral Philosophy which treats of only a kind of happiness. Nor can it be objected that the happiness of the other life is the only real happiness. For this is not the fact. It is the only perfect happiness, but not the only real.

In a word, Moral Philosophy does not treat of Good, even of moral Good, as tending to secure or compass any object; but it treats of the laws by which man may, in his actions, accomplish moral good, and so, by a repetition of good actions, produce, in his soul, those good habits

* An obvious illustration is Astronomy, a science which treats of the physical order of the stars and the laws which govern it. The supreme principle of that order is God's Will—its end His glory. Would any one pretend for a moment that either subject came within the astronomer's province?

which are *boni mores*. Hence the name of *Philosophia Morum*.

6. And this faulty definition leads us to speak of another serious defect, and one which cannot be remedied. We mean the author's use of the word Good, which is by no means steady and consistent. Sometimes he intends by it only the object, physical or notional, which incites the rational or the sensitive appetite. Sometimes the ontological quality which is the object of God's complacency. We think this inconstancy arises from his not having laid up in his mind, that *bonitas* and *malitia*, as predicated morally of actions, are not primary but secondary qualities, deriving from their *rectitudo* or *pravitas*: the primary moral quality being conceived to superinduce a secondary one akin to that property, goodness or evil, which makes things be sought after or shunned by the appetite. Hence he did not advert that of these two positions,

Actions are good inasmuch as they are right,

Actions are good because they are right,
the former is false, the latter true. This was the origin of the sophistical argument we quoted above from his first chapter. All men always, in all circumstances, seek good, real or apparent, and they do so of a natural invincible necessity; but this good need not be—too often is not—moral good.

7. The origin of moral obligation is placed by M. Laforet in the act of the Divine Will, commanding us to observe the order of the natural relations of things: God's right to command being a necessary consequence of His having created us. In a note, attached to page 414, we suggested that, while this theory made out God's right unmistakeably, it said nothing as to our duty. What, we asked, would come of the exercise of such a right, unless we were previously obliged to obey? We now add, first, that according to the theory of the author, there must be an intrinsic difference between moral good and evil, prior to any act of the divine will. For an action is not good because God knows it or wills it, but He knows it because it is good. Now an action is good or evil, only inasmuch as it is conformable to an obligatory rule or not. We say obligatory. For if an action merely differ from some wise, or prudent, or honourable rule, it is not therefore morally evil. As your action is not morally good, merely because performed in consequence of the counsel of some

very wise man; so neither could it be morally evil, because performed in disregard of his advice. Since then, according to the author's theory, prior to any act of God, there is an *intrinsic difference* between actions morally good and morally evil, and since moral goodness or evil supposes the existence of some rule possessing real moral obligation: it follows, that prior to any act of God, there exists a moral rule possessing real obligatory power. We may add that we put forward this objection, not as precisely embodying any views of our own, but as springing directly from the author's own views on the intrinsic order of the necessary relations of things.

Secondly, we would also observe, that the way in which M. Laforet explains how it comes to pass that God commands the observance of the moral order, is eminently *unsatisfactory*. The intrinsic goodness of the moral order is sometimes regarded as the object of the Divine Will, sometimes as a consequence of God's act. Sometimes it is spoken of as being really synonymous with the Divine Nature, sometimes as possessing an abstract reality. In the end it is not at all clear that this abstract reality is not the principle of the divine command. This is very faulty. For it must inevitably force on one's mind the conclusion that the subject is too difficult to be resolved otherwise than by taking refuge in Kant's theory of a synthetic judgment *à priori*. Honestly, in M. Laforet's theory, we cannot see our way to the reality of moral obligation or any logical principle whence it might be derived.

8. Finally, we are not at all satisfied with M. Laforet's theory of right. It is now some years since philosophers have begun to recognize right as a distinct branch of philosophy. And the Philosophy of Right has had a separate chair devoted to its exposition in Louvain, Pavia, Padua, Turin, Pisa, Naples, and all the German Universities. In his preface (p. 9) M. Laforet thus expresses himself:—

"We must now say a word on the distinction which has been established between moral philosophy and natural right.

"In the teaching of Universities in the present day, natural right and moral philosophy are treated separately. The course of natural right, or of the philosophy of right, as it is also called, may be a useful introduction to the study of positive right, by appropriating especially to this study some general principle of the moral order. Besides, to this course we may reserve the discussion of certain

points of the moral order, which concern the exterior relations of men amongst themselves, as members of a family, as members of a civil society, and as members of humanity in general. But to confine ourselves to the truth, we must not forget that these principles are moral principles, we must not lose sight of the fact that these various points should arise from moral philosophy, and be fixed there. Right can never be other than a dependance on moral philosophy. Beyond this it is nothing.

"We do not admit then, in the first place, this radical distinction between right and moral philosophy, which has been established with so much éclat by Kant and adopted after him very generally in Germany, this distinction does not seem to us to repose on a philosophic foundation. Kant, because of the subjective and abstract basis of his philosophy, could not, as we will prove in this work, elevate himself to the generative principle of morality or of right. Thus where there is question of principles, he more frequently only rests in abstractions, or at best in secondary and necessary notions which in themselves have no value. This particular happens in the question of the difference between right and moral philosophy. The treatise of moral philosophy and of right of the profound thinker of Königsberg, contain excellent detail; but they seem to us to want a basis."

Carrying out this view, the author treats, as we have already seen, promiscuously of duties and of rights: and in page 85 he distinctly lays down that rights produce duties.

"D'où vient que l'homme a le devoir de faire telle ou telle chose? C'est qu'il existe un droit supérieur qui l'impose: le devoir présuppose toujours le droit, et il n'en est que l'effet."

He had already observed in page 80.

"J'ai des devoirs à remplir encore mes semblables; à ces devoirs correspondent chez eux des droits. Ils ont droit à exiger que je me conduise de telle ou de telle manière à leur regard."

Without commenting on the contradiction between the two passages; we shall just observe, that in accordance with the theory laid down in the last passage, since we are bound to give alms, not only in general, but sometimes in an individual case; an individual beggar might address himself to me imperatively, and insist on receiving an alms, or on my declining to comply with this modest request, might proceed to help himself thereto—a doctrine equally averse to the Natural Law, and to the seventh commandment.

We had intended to explain at some length the nature and extent of the Philosophy of Right, in order to vindicate

its importance, and shew its true basis. But we have devoted so much space to other subjects, that we must considerably epitomize the remarks we intended offering on this.

The Philosophy of Right is, then, that branch of science which demonstrates and explains the rights both of God and of man. Confining our attention to this latter branch, right may be defined as a moral faculty of action, conformable to reason, and protected by some moral law, which distinctly forbids, that any one should interfere with its exercise. Now a faculty of acting—of doing something—is a good, therefore connected with our happiness; also, this faculty of action, which is a right, must be itself moral (that is not forbidden) and must be also protected by the sanction of a moral law. Hence we have the Philosophy of Right touching on one side on Eudæmonology, and on the other on Ethics. The General Philosophy of Right embraces three functions and three parts. (1) The determination of what rights exist; this part may be called Rational Right. (2) The application of the former part to the consideration of what descriptions of laws ought to be enacted; this part is the Theory of positive laws, or the science of legislation. (3) The application of this theory to the actual laws of a state, in order to ascertain their defects or good qualities; this is the Critique of positive laws. The first part is commonly called the Science of Natural Right; the latter two unitedly the Science of Positive Right.

The Philosophy of Right is intimately connected with Political Philosophy or the Science of Government; the latter has for its object prudence, the former justice, hence the former is, the science of the end, the latter of the means. Hence the Philosophy of Right establishes the basis and origin of all human authority, as well as of all legislation thence derived. This is sufficient to demonstrate its importance.

Fixing our attention on the science of Rational or Natural Right, indicated above, a complete treatise on it would, in our opinion, involve two great leading divisions; viz., (1) that which would treat of the first principle or essence of Right, (2) that which would enumerate and classify all rights derived from that first principle. This second part would treat of the way in which rights may be

derived from their first principle, and then of the actual rights themselves. These will be divided into

- I. Natural, and
- II. Acquired Rights.

Rights may be acquired by the act of

- I. An individual producing

(a.) *New rights (as by occupation, production, etc.)*

(b.) *Or Modifications of existing rights :*

Or they may be acquired by the acts of

- II. MANY UNITED TOGETHER { be those many individuals
or moral bodies,

And this in two ways,

A. *WITHOUT A CONTRACT, OR*

B. *WITH A CONTRACT, which may regard either*

(a.) *The objects only of the right (as in buying or selling)*

(b.) *The subjects themselves of the right, inasmuch as it associates them, thus producing Society and giving birth to*

- I. *SOCIAL RIGHT, which is*

A. *GENERAL (common to all societies), and this both*

1. *Internal (of the members of the social body between themselves, mutually,—also called Civil right.)*

2. *External—or right of the members of the society towards its Government and vice-versâ—also called Political right.*

B. *And Special (proper to each kind of society), viz :*

1. *Rights of societies instituted for the purpose of obtaining*

certain other rights—(Conjugal Society—Parental Society—Industrial and Commercial associations, etc.)

2. *Rights of Societies instituted for the purpose of regulating the Modality of rights already existing, their defence, their better coexistence, etc,—such societies, may be*

(a.) *Partial—Associations of defence.*

(b.) *Universal—or Civil Society.**

- II. *EXTRA SOCIAL RIGHT—that is those rights which exist independently of the association, in the individual associates, during the period of their association.*

We should finally treat of the various modifications, which, owing to various causes, all these several rights undergo, without losing their specific identity.

Such is the Philosophy of Right, as we conceive it, and

* This subject opens out an immense field, which for clearness' sake, must be divided carefully into several parts, each treated distinctly. We have not space now even to indicate such a division.

pretty much as we know it is taught in some of the first Universities of Europe. Can any one pretend, that it is narrow, or small, or unimportant? *Were there any such,* we would only remind him, that the Hegelian school have given it an immense impulse in Germany; they have set about arranging the legislation and codes of the several states according to its dictates; and they are working hard *to make it emphatically their own science.* Earnestly do we hope that our new university will aid in resisting this last object, and uniting its efforts to those of similar Catholic Institutions abroad, help to make the Philosophy of Right, in form and treatment, as in reality, a Catholic science. It can do so the more easily, for in these countries it is little known, and less understood; and the true doctrine would not have much trouble in extirpating the few false notions which, with the Hegelian works, have been imported from Germany.

For the rest, we have honestly stated our objections to M. Laforet's book. We must now, with equal honesty, recommend it most warmly to our readers, as a work which will both instruct and please them. They will find in it much and valuable information with which they had previously been unacquainted. And unless we deceive ourselves greatly, they will recognize in the author a most pious, able, and eloquent exponent of the truth.

ART. VII.—(1.) Christianity in China, Tartary, and Thibet. By M. l'Abbé Huc, 2 vols., 8vo. London, Longmans, 1857.

(2.) Relation d'un Voyage au Thibet en 1852, et d'un Voyage chez les Abors en 1853, par M. l'Abbé Krick. 12mo. Paris, Vatou, 1854.

THE internal condition of China has long been one of the puzzles of history. Its social and political institutions, while they imply the existence from immemorial time of a high order of refinement and civilization, have long been regarded, not only in the last degree peculiar, but even as hardly referable to any common principle

through which, as a medium, they might be compared with those of other empires. Even its religion, although essentially the same which is professed by the great body of the Trans-Gangetic races, is commonly believed to be so modified by national peculiarities as to present all the characteristics of a new and distinct system.

Since the first establishment of the Jesuit Missionaries in China in the seventeenth century, European writers, up to a very recent period, were content to refer to the narratives or the historical and descriptive publications of that great Society, as the most authentic sources of information regarding this strange country and its inhabitants. The native literature of China, whether ancient or modern, remained entirely unexplored, even by the most accomplished of our western linguists. Etienne Fourmont was perhaps the first who, without residing in the country itself, arrived at anything approaching to a mastery of the Chinese language. His pupils, Deshauterayes and De Guignes, (especially the latter) pursued the same study with considerable success; and Matthew Langles, who edited Pere Amiot's *Mantchu Dictionary*, attained a still larger though perhaps less reliable reputation. But it was not till after the establishment of the new chair of Chinese in the College de France at the Restoration that the study can be said to have become naturalized in Europe. The first occupant of this chair, the illustrious Abel Remusat, may truly be called the father of the study. The numerous practical treatises published by him or under his inspiration, tended, more than all that had been produced before his time, to facilitate the acquisition of the language by Europeans. His learned essays and dissertations contributed to awaken the attention of scholars to the great importance as well as the vast extent and antiquity of the literature; and his numerous translations and specimens, especially of its lighter and more characteristic publications, went farther to popularize the study not only in France, but even in Germany and England, than the ponderous though truly learned and valuable compilations of the earlier writers upon Chinese letters.

What Remusat began M. Stanislas Julien has worthily pursued, in Essays, in contributions to the *Journal Asiatique*, and in many other forms. Above all, his

recent life of *Hiouen-Tsang*,* the Buddhist pilgrim to India of the seventh century, is only a sample of what we have yet to learn from a systematic examination of the literary remains of ancient China; but it is an evidence not alone that the early history of this singular nation, and the true nature of their religious, political, and social system, are alone to be derived satisfactorily from native authorities, but also that such authorities exist in a number and of a value which has hitherto been but faintly conjectured, or at least imperfectly understood. China not only can no longer be excluded from consideration in those general problems of ethnography which have occupied so large a share of public attention, but it must even assume an especial prominence on that common map of the human race, on which, notwithstanding its vastness, it had hitherto possessed but little practical interest, by reason of its complete and almost hopeless isolation.

The scholars and philosophers, too, who have given their attention of late years to the questions connected with China, have gradually emancipated themselves from those traditional notions, in pursuance of which it was habitually regarded as a country entirely without relations even with those eastern races by which it is surrounded. Lassen's great work on Indian Antiquities, has fully opened up the connexion of the Buddhism of India with that of China. Spence Hardy, though with far less learning or research, has supplied materials for the comparison of at least one branch of its religious system with that of Ceylon. Father San Germano, and more recently M. Dubois de Jaucigny, have done the same for the Birman Empire. The later Dutch writers on Japan have rivalled in industry, if not in success, the researches of the modern Chinese scholars. *Mgr. de Pallegoix*, the distinguished vicar apostolic of Siam, from whom Sir John Bowring has drawn most of his information, has left little to be desired towards a complete account of the religious and social institutions of the Siamese. Last of all, Père Huc has taken up carefully all the links of the chain which connect both the history and the usages of Tartary and Thibet with

* Histoire de la Vie de Hiouen-Tsang et de ses Voyages dans l'Inde, depuis l'an 629, jusqu' en 645. Traduite du Chinois par Stanislas Julien, Paris, 1856.

those of their Chinese masters; with both which subjects *Père Huc may be safely acknowledged to possess an acquaintance, such as has not fallen to the lot of any European since the days of Father Ricci or Adam Schall.*

*Père Huc's studies on the general subject of China have formed an admirable preparation for the work which he has just published on that particular topic of Chinese history, the interest of which must, in his eyes, infinitely transcend that of all the rest—the history and prospect of Christianity throughout its vast empire. It is impossible to consider satisfactorily the prospects of the new religion which the Missionary seeks to introduce unless in its bearing upon the principles which it is destined to displace. It may be necessary to remind those who are not acquainted with Père Huc's earlier works on China, that although it cannot be said that any established religion exists in the Chinese Empire, yet there are three great religious systems which, (if we except the very inconsiderable fragment who profess Mahomedanism, Judaism, and Christianity,) divide among them the entire body of the population. The first and most ancient of these is called *Jou kiao*, "The Doctrine of the Lettered;"—a sort of philosophic, but materialistic, Pantheism. *The Jou Kiao* is regarded as the religion established or reformed by Confucius. The second, that of Lao-tze, the contemporary of Confucius, is regarded by its professors as the primitive religion of the ancient inhabitants of China. The creed of Lao-tze admits, as a *First Cause, Reason*—an uncreated Being, who is the type of the Universe, but who has himself no type of his being; and it regards human souls as emanations from this ethereal substance, destined to be reunited therewith after death. The third, the Religion of Fo, or Buddha, is believed to have been introduced about the commencement of our era, which is little more than the common system of Indian Buddhism, with certain striking modifications, which the very contact with the pre-existing religious doctrines have produced. The number of Mahomedans and Jews, as well as of certain sects of Manichean origin, is so small, and their position so entirely unimportant, that they need hardly be taken into account at all.*

Of these three systems, however, in so far as they can be said to enter into the intellectual or moral character of the people, that of Confucius is by far the most important. It

forms an essential part of the very constitution of the state. Itself without a priestly or sacrificial order, the civil magistrates in their several grades, are its ministers ; and the emperor may in some sense be regarded as the head of its hierarchy. All the learned men of the empire, and all who aspire to that character, attach themselves to it, as an indispensable preliminary. The tablet of Confucius is in all the schools ; the masters and pupils prostrate themselves before his name at the beginning and the end of the classes : his image is found in every academy ; it holds a prominent position in every assembly of the learned, and every place of literary examination ; and the honour with which it is everywhere treated, (whether this honour be regarded as religious or as purely civil,) or rather the unexampled fidelity with which this honour has been continued by a nation of so many millions of men for a period of more than two thousand years, is, perhaps, the most remarkable feature in the character of this singular nation, and one of the most extraordinary circumstances in all the marvels of their history.

This, too, is the great adversary with which Christianity has had to contend in its long continued struggle to obtain a footing in China—the momentous struggle which forms the subject of Père Huc's most interesting volumes. Accordingly, to those who recollect the full and circumstantial details, historical as well as descriptive, regarding the religion of China, into which M. Huc entered in his invaluable work "*The Chinese Empire*," it is hardly necessary to say that the present work must be in some respects a repetition, or rather an extension, of the information on religious subjects which was anticipated in that admirable book ; but as in the work now before us, the subject of religion is not only treated much more in detail, but is also considered chiefly from the Christian point of view, "*Christianity in China*" may fairly be regarded as substantially a new work ; and even when it goes over ground already trodden, its information will be found much more precise, more orderly, and more complete, than the necessarily brief and condensed notices which formed the great charm of the work on *The Chinese Empire*.

In truth, the popular notions on the history of Christianity in China are vague and obscure in the extreme. Beyond a floating belief that the Nestorian Missions of the eighth and ninth centuries in some way extended to

China, or at least to some portion of the vast territory now tributary to China, hardly anything is known of the subject even by scholars, until the period of the adventurous appearance of the Jesuit fathers in the seventeenth century. To this early, and we may say, unknown and unexplored portion of the subject, Père Huc has devoted the greater part of his first volume, and indeed he may be truly said to have exhausted it. It is not merely that he has collected together with great industry and learning, and has arranged with much clearness and simplicity, all the scattered fragments of evidence derivable from the ancient writers, and has examined and discussed with great ability and with singular candour and moderation the conclusions which modern scholars have drawn from these records. The great value of his work and its chief claim to the character of novelty, consists in the use which he has made of what earlier writers had entirely neglected, or rather ignored—the native Chinese authorities. He has not only availed himself of all the lights which the eminent Chinese scholars of the French Academy, Remusat, Stanislas Julien, and Renan, have supplied; but he has also drawn largely upon his own profound and critical knowledge of the Chinese language and literature; and we need hardly say that his intimate acquaintance with the general history of the Church during the periods in question, has enabled him to turn to important use every incident or allusion, however obscure, that can be derived from the native historians of China.

Much, of course, of the learning and ingenuity which he has thus applied to the elucidation of the early history of Christianity in China, is of a nature which can only be fully appreciated by a careful and detailed study of his work. And as our principal concern in this article will be with the history of the missions of the 17th and 18th centuries, we must confine ourselves, for the earlier and less generally interesting period, to a few of the more prominent epochs, and especially to those which have at different times given rise to controversy among European scholars. We should add that the volumes now published only carry the narrative as far as the death of the emperor Chun-Tche, whose reign may be regarded as the commencement of the Mantchoo dynasty in China.

Of the first introduction of the Christian faith into China, no distinct trace can now be ascertained. It is

certain, nevertheless, that from a very remote antiquity, probably from the seventh century before the birth of Christ, there have been members of the Jewish race in China, many of whom were raised in early times to the highest civil and military offices, and even attained to great literary eminence and distinction. Where the Jewish religion had effected an entrance, Christianity has never been slow to follow; nor is there any solid reason to doubt the ancient tradition of the Christians in India, which is confirmed by several passages in their liturgies and sacred offices, that the apostolic labours of St. Thomas and his disciples extended as far as the Chinese Sea.

The most curious monument of early Chinese Christianity, however, is the celebrated and much canvassed inscription of Si-gnan-Fou, to which Père Huc has devoted an extremely interesting chapter.

The history of this remarkable inscription deserves a brief notice. In the early part of the seventeenth century (1625), a number of native Chinese workmen, while engaged in digging a "foundation for a house, outside the walls of the city of Si-gnan-Fou, the capital of the province of Chen-Si, found buried in the earth, a large monumental stone, resembling those which the Chinese are in the habit of raising to preserve to posterity the remembrance of remarkable events and illustrious men. It was a dark-coloured marble tablet, ten feet high and five broad, and bearing on one side an inscription in ancient Chinese, and also some other characters quite unknown in China. The discovery excited much attention among the mandarins and the population of the country. The stone was publicly exhibited, and visited by crowds of curious persons; and amongst others, some Jesuit missionaries, who were at that time scattered about China, in various missions, went to examine it. The first who saw it was Father Alvares Semedo; then came Martin Martini, author of the Chinese Atlas, and Michael Boym, a Pole, who, with the assistance of a Chinese man of letters, undertook the interpretation of the inscription." The discovery at once became public and attracted much notice. A copy of the inscription was made by order of the Emperor, and deposited in a very celebrated pagoda near the city of Si-gnan-Fou, where it still remains, and where it was seen and examined by several Chinese acquaintances of Père Huc during his residence at Peking. *Exact tracings of the*

stone were at once transmitted to Europe upon its discovery. One of these was deposited in the library of the Jesuit house at Rome; and another was transmitted to Paris, and deposited in the Bibliotheque du Roi, where it is still preserved.

The inscription, as we have seen, consists of two distinct parts.

The first which is in ancient Chinese characters was translated without much difficulty, and the learned world was taken completely by surprise to find that this inscription in Chinese characters (which was dated from the seventh century of our era,) recorded, among many other events of the period, the history of the preaching of the gospel in China by a missionary from the Roman Empire, and his favourable reception by the then Emperor, Tching-Tsouan.

The second portion of the inscription, (which was unintelligible to its first discoverers,) was found, upon examination by other scholars, to be written in the ancient Syriac characters, known as *estrangelhos*. It contains, in ninety lines, the names of the Syrian priests who accompanied or followed the missionary already described in his mission to China.

Père Huc describes its contents as follows:—

"It is stated on the monumental stone in question, that a religious man, named Olopen, a man of eminent virtue, came, in 635, from *Ta-Thsin* (the Roman Empire) to Si-guan-Fou. The Emperor sent his officers to meet him in the western suburb of the city, had him brought to the palace, and ordered him to translate the sacred books that he had brought with him. These books having been examined, the Emperor pronounced the doctrine they contained good, and permitted its publication. The decree issued to this effect is cited in the inscription. It is therein asserted, to the honour of the doctrine taught by Olopen, that under the dynasty of Tcheou, the law of truth was eclipsed in China, and having been carried towards the West by Lao-Tze, has now returned to its primitive source, to increase the splendour of the reigning dynasty. This doctrine proclaims, that Aloho (that is, God, in the Syriac language) created the heavens and the earth; and that Satan, having seduced the first man, God sent the Messiah to deliver the human race from the original sin; that the Messiah was born of a virgin, in the country of Ta-Thsin, and that the Persians went to adore him, in order that the law and the prediction might be accomplished."—Vol. i. pp. 47-8.

As Père Huc does not enter into the details of the controversy to which this alleged discovery gave occasion, it may be interesting to add that the inscription has been published and defended as genuine by Father Kircher in his *China Illustrata*; by Andrew Müller in a treatise printed at Berlin in 1762; by Renaudot in his *Relation Anciennes des Indes et de la Chine de deux Voyageurs Mahometans*; and by Joseph Assemani in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. On the contrary, its genuineness was warmly disputed by many protestant writers, and especially by Böhlen, who unhesitatingly stigmatises it as a pious fraud of the Jesuit missionaries themselves.

All these writers describe the monument itself as a marble slab two feet long by four broad, surmounted by a pyramidal cross. The Chinese inscription is in twenty-eight columns, each containing sixty-two words; and on one side of the slab, as well as at the bottom, is found the Syriac inscription to which we have already referred, and which enumerates by name a series of priests, deacons, and other clerks, together with a bishop, arranged in seven distinct classes. The principal inscription opens with a recital (although it must be owned, in terms sufficiently obscure and curiously accommodated to the prevailing notions of Chinese theology,) of the fundamental principles of the Christian religion. It then recounts the arrival of the missionaries in the year 636; their reception by the Emperor; and the principal events of their history, and that of the mission for a space of a hundred and forty-four years, and especially of two persecutions, one in 699 and the other in 713; and the arrival of a fresh body of missionaries soon after the second persecution. The date of the erection of the monument is also recited A.D. 781.

As the works in which this interesting document has been published are for the most part rare, we shall transcribe so much of Père Huc's admirable translation, as contains the curious abstract of Christian doctrine, to which we have alluded, and also the history of its early preachers in China.

"There has always been one only true Cause, essentially the first, and without beginning, supremely intelligent and immaterial; essentially the last, and uniting all perfections. He placed the poles of the heavens, and created all beings; marvellously holy;

he is the source of all perfection. This admirable being, is he not the *Triune*, the true Lord without beginning, *Oloho*?*

"He divided the world by a cross into four parts. After having decomposed the primordial air, he gave birth to the two elements.†

"Chaos was transformed, and then the sun and the moon appeared. He made the sun and the moon move‡ to produce day and night. He elaborated and perfected the ten thousand things;§ but in creating the first man, he endowed him with perfect interior harmony. He enjoined him to watch over the sea of his desires. His nature was without vice, and without error; his heart, pure and simple, was originally without disorderly appetites.

"But Sa-Than propagated lies, and stained by his malice that which had been pure and holy.|| He proclaimed, as a truth, the equality of greatness, and upset all ideas. This is why three hundred and sixty-five sects¶, lending each other a mutual support, formed a long chain, and wove, so to speak, a net of law. Some put the creature in the place of the Eternal, others denied the existence of beings, and destroyed the two principles. Others instituted prayers and sacrifices to obtain good fortune; others proclaimed their own sanctity, to deceive mankind. The minds of men laboured, and were filled with anxiety; aspirations towards the supreme good were trampled down; thus perpetually floating about, they attained to nothing, and all went from bad to worse.** The darkness thickened, men lost their sight, and for a long time they wandered without being able to find it again.

"Then our Tri-une God communicated his substance to the very venerable *Mi-chi-ho* (Messiah), who, veiling his true majesty,

"* This name, foreign to the Chinese language, is evidently a translation of *Eloha*, the true name of God in Syriac.

"† The *Yn* and the *Yang*, which play so great a part among Chinese philosophers.

"‡ Modern astronomy has shown that it is the movement of the sun, which draws after it that of the earth. It would be curious if this fact were known to the author of the inscription.

"§ *Wan-ou*, ten thousand things. is the Chinese expression for the totality of created beings.

"|| This expression is obscure, but it seems to us that it is meant to indicate the Indian and Chinese pantheism.

"¶ This number, which corresponds to the days in the year, expresses, according to the genius of the Chinese language, a great multitude, an uninterrupted series.

"** Literally, *the boiled meat turned to roast*.

appeared in the world in the likeness of a man. The celestial spirits manifested their joy, and a Virgin brought forth the Saint in Ta-Thsin. The most splendid constellations announced this happy event; the Persians saw the splendour, and ran to pay tribute. He fulfilled what was said of old by the twenty-four saints;* he organised, by his precepts, both families and kingdoms; he instituted the new religion, according to the pure notion of the Trinity in Unity; he regulated conscience by true faith; he signified to the world the eight commandments, and purged humanity from its pollutions, by opening the door to the three virtues. He diffused life and extinguished death; he suspended the luminous sun to destroy the dwelling of darkness, and then the lies of demons passed away. He directed the bark of mercy toward the palace of light, and all creatures endowed with intelligence have been succoured. After having consummated this act of power, he rose at mid-day towards the Truth. Twenty-seven books have been left.† He has enlarged the springs of mercy, that men might be converted. The baptism by water and by the Spirit, is a law that purifies the soul and beautifies the exterior. The sign of the cross unites the four quarters of the world, and restores the harmony that had been destroyed. By striking upon a piece of wood,‡ we make the voice of charity and mercy resound; by sacrificing towards the East, we indicate the way of life and glory.

"Our ministers allow their beards to grow, to show that they are devoted to their neighbours. The tonsure that they wear at the top of their heads indicates that they have renounced worldly desires. In giving liberty to slaves, we become a link between the powerful and the weak. We do not accumulate riches, and we share with the poor that which we possess. Fasting strengthens the intellectual powers, abstinence and moderation preserve health. We worship seven times a day, and by our prayers we aid the living and the dead. On the seventh day we offer sacrifice, after having purified our hearts, and received absolution for our sins. This religion, so perfect and so excellent, is difficult to name, but it

"* An allusion to the four great prophets and the twelve lesser ones, by adding to whom Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Job, Moses, Samuel, David, and John the Baptist, they make twenty-four.

"† Namely the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, three of St. John, one of St. James, two of St. Peter, one of St. Jude, and the Apocalypse.

"‡ It is customary in China in the pagodas and monasteries to strike either on a bell or a piece of bamboo, to call the devout to prayer.

enlightens darkness by its brilliant precepts. It is called the Luminous Religion."*—Vol. i. pp. 48-51.

The theological reader will probably observe, in the paragraph which describes the Incarnation, certain expressions, which, although perhaps susceptible of an orthodox interpretation, nevertheless, in their natural construction, clearly involve the Nestorian principle of the two-fold Personality of Christ, Divine and Human.

The inscription proceeds to relate the arrival of the missionaries from the West.

"The Emperor Tai-Tsoung illustrated the empire. He opened the revolution, and governed men in holiness. In his time there was a man of high virtue named Olopen, who came from the kingdom of Ta-Thsin. Directed by the blue clouds, he bore the Scriptures of the true doctrine; he observed the rules of the winds, and traversed difficult and perilous countries.

"In the ninth year of Tching-Kouan (636), he arrived at Tchang-ngan. The emperor ordered Fang-hi-wen-Ling, first minister of the empire, to go with a great train of attendants to the western suburb, to meet the stranger, and bring him to the palace. He had the Holy Scriptures translated in the imperial library. The court listened to the doctrine, meditated on it profoundly, and understood the great unity of truth. A special edict was promulgated for its publication and diffusion.

"In the twelfth year of Tching-Kouan in the seventh moon, during the Autumn, the new edict was promulgated in these terms:—

"The doctrine has no fixed name, the holy has no determinate substance; it institutes religions suitable to various countries, and carries men in crowds in its track. Olopen, a man of Ta-Thsin, and of a lofty virtue, bearing Scriptures and images, has come to offer them in the Supreme Court. After a minute examination of the spirit of this religion, it has been found to be excellent, mysterious, and pacific. The contemplation of its radical principle gives birth to perfection, and fixes the will. It is exempt from verbosity; it considers only good results. It is useful to men, and consequently ought to be published under the whole extent of the heavens. I, therefore, command the magistrates to have a Ta-Thsin temple constructed in the quarter named I-ning of the imperial city, and twenty-one religious men shall be installed therein."

"* *King-Khiao* means, literally, luminous religion. A Russian scholar, who has made a rather inaccurate translation of the above inscription, has rendered these two Chinese characters most erroneously as *orthodox religion*."

"The virtue of the venerable dynasty of Tcheou was extinct; the *Blue Chariot* had passed to the West. The wisdom of the dynasty of Thang having shone forth, a luminous ray has penetrated to the East. The magistrates have received orders, and a genuine writing of the sovereign has been traced on the wall of the temple. A Celestial beauty, with splendid colours, has made the Luminous Gate to shine. This sacred testimony of the Emperor has been a source of felicity; it will eternally lighten the universe.

"The great Emperor Kao-Tsung followed respectfully in the footsteps of his ancestors. He fertilised the Truth, conferred splendour on it, and raised *luminous* temples in all the provinces. He heaped new titles on Olopen, and appointed him Guardian of the Empire, and Lord of the Great Law. The law was thus propagated along the Ten Roads. The empire thus received fruitful germs of felicity; the temples filled a hundred cities, and the Families were enriched with admirable happiness."—Vol. i. pp. 51-3.

It would be tedious to enter into the arguments by which the authenticity of this interesting monument has been defended against the suspicions of the Protestant critics of the seventeenth century, and against the sneers of Voltaire and his followers in the eighteenth. But there is one part of the subject as it is treated by Père Huc, to which, as it is both novel and decisive, we cannot help adverting. We allude to the authorities which he produces from native Chinese writers, ancient and modern, both attesting the authenticity of the description and confirmatory of its testimony of the truth of that early introduction of Christianity in China which it records. We can only find room for a few.

The first is from the collection of inscriptions entitled *Kin-Che-Sui-Pien*.

"In the period Tsong-Tching (1628—1643) of the dynasty of Ming, the Governor of Si-ngan-Fou, named Tsing-Ling-Tseou, and surnamed Master Tsing-Tchang, had a young son, called Hoa-Sing. Nature had endowed him with rare intelligence, and scarcely was he able to walk, before he knew how to fold his hands and adore Fo. At the age of twelve years he showed the greatest ardour for study; but soon there came a spot upon his eyes, and at the moment when he was smiling at his father, he suddenly died.

"After having consulted the fates, his friends desired to bury him, to the south of the monastery of Kin-Ching-Sse (the City of Gold). When the earth had been dug to the depth of a few feet, a great stone was found. It was the inscription of the luminous doctrine which has spread through the Central Empire.

“ ‘This stone which had been buried in the earth for a thousand years, was then brought to light. The inscription may be seen in the collection entitled *Lieou-yu-hoa-Tsi*. All the characters were perfect, and there was not one damaged. In the lower part, and at the extremity, are traced a multitude of strange characters, such as are seen in the books of Fo.’ ”—Vol. i. pp. 75-6.

Another of the great modern classics of China—“The Imperial Geography,”—describes the present position of the Inscription.

“ ‘King-ching-Sse (the monastery of the City of Gold). This monastery is situated outside the western suburb of Si-ngan-Fou. It was formerly the monastery of the Sublime Humanity Tsoung-Jin-Sse, and was founded under the Thang. This monastery possesses the inscriptions of the Pagoda of the Master of the Law, of the epoch of Thang, engraved upon sandal wood. It possesses also the inscription on stone, entitled ‘Inscription upon stone of the luminous religion propagated in the Central Empire.’ During the years Thien-Tchun (1457—1464), the strangers from Thsin repaired it.’ ”—Vol. i. pp. 76-7.

But a still more curious evidence of the genuineness of the Inscription, or at least of the truth of the history which it records, is derived from the works of many of the early historians and encyclopædists of China; and especially from a well-known Chinese classical author of the eleventh century of our era, Min-Khieou—his “Description of Si-ngan-Fou,” as well as from several similar works of even earlier date.

“We might, if we pleased, indeed, contest the authority of the authors just quoted, and insinuate that the new edition of the Imperial Geography was revised and corrected under the influence of the Jesuits, who were powerful enough, and skilful enough, to deceive the learned, lull to sleep their jealousy, and induce them to print, in an important and official work, details of their own invention. All the passages favourable to the inscription which are to be found in the modern works of Chinese authors, may be put down at once to the account of the Jesuits, and so go for nothing.

“But here again we have a very well known Chinese author, Min Khieou, who wrote under the dynasty of Song, in 1060, and who, according to all probability, had not at that period experienced the influence of the Jesuits. He expresses himself thus in his work entitled “Description of Si-ngan-Fou” :—

“ ‘In the street of Justice (*T-ning*) may be seen the temple of Po-Sse-Sse. It was built in the twelfth year of the period of Tching-Kouan (638) by order of the Emperor Tai-Tsoung, in favour of O-lo-Sse (Olopen) a religious stranger from the kingdom of Ta-

Thsin.' The same work says again :—' There was formerly at Singan-Fou, eastward of the street of the Sweet Spring (*Li-Kuen*), a temple of Po-Sse (of Persia). In the second year of the period I-Fong (677), three devout Persians desired that another temple should be constructed.'

"A Chinese encyclopædia, published under the dynasty of Song, in the year 1005, contains the following imperial decree :—

"'In the ninth moon of the fourth year of the period Thien-Pao (745), the emperor issued a decree, in which it is said : 'The luminous doctrine came from Ta-Thsin ; its partizans transmitted it from one to the other, so that at last it spread through the Central kingdom. Then they began to build temples, and from thence came their name, temples of Ta-Thsin.' If it is desired to make them known to men, it is necessary to ascend to their origin ; and that is why, in the two capitals of China, it is proper to change the name of temple of Po-Sse into temple of Ta-Thsin. It is proper that, in all the circles of the empire, this rule should be conformed to.'

"This imperial decree of 745 is reported in an encyclopædia published in 1005; the passages from Min-Khieou, author of a 'Description of Si-ngan-Fou,' were published in 1060 ; so this cannot be accounted for by the supposition of a 'pious fraud of the Jesuits.'

"These decisive testimonies were repeated by Tsienche (who was living in 1063, under the emperor Jin-Tsoung, and was a contemporary of the above-named Min-Khieou) in his work, entitled, 'Examination of the Luminous Doctrine.'

"Tsien-che, after having cited the very words of the encyclopædia, and of Min-Khieou, his contemporary, continues thus :—'It was then, at this epoch, that the building of the temples of Ta-Thsin was commenced. The inscription says : 'In the kingdom of Ta-Thsin there was a man of superior virtue, named O-lo-Pen. In the ninth year of the period Tching-Kouan (636), he came to Singan-Fou. In the seventh moon of the same period (638), a temple of Ta-Thsin was built in the street of Justice and Peace (T-ning). O-lo-Pen is the same as O-lo-Sse, of whom Min-Khieou speaks. In the beginning, the temple was called the temple of Po-Sse. In the period I-Fong (676—679) it still retained its ancient name, but in the fourth year Tien-Pao (745) its name was changed into that of temple of Ta-Thsin.'

"Tsien-che, in his examination of the luminous doctrine, passes in review the various religions which have come from foreign countries and been propagated in the empire. He speaks especially in detail, and by no means in a tone of eulogy, of the Manicheans, or disciples of Mo-Ni (Manes), and of the worshippers of fire, or disciples of Zoroaster. After declaring that these doctrines are false and perverse, he continues thus :—'As to the luminous doctrine, which has spread like a river, its professors are the most intelligent

of all the barbarians above-mentioned ; they understand the characters (Chinese), but they flourish in their language, and tell quantities of lies. In reality, they do not differ from the Manicheans and worshippers of fire.'—Vol. i. pp. 77-9.

Nevertheless, while Pere Huc thus learnedly vindicates the genuineness of this first explicit record of the existence of Christianity in China, he at the same time shows, by the strongest evidence, that long before the date of the Si-ngan-Fou Inscription, the Christian religion had been preached and known in that kingdom. The details of its history, both before and after this period, are obscure and unconnected. It is known that Timothy, one of the Nestorian patriarchs, about the end of the eighth century, sent missionaries into eastern Asia, and that one at least, of these, reached the Chinese territory. Several monks also of the same communion were invested, soon after, with the episcopal character, and assigned to these missions ; and, from a canon of one of the synods held by the Nestorian patriarch in the middle of the ninth century, which dispenses the bishops of these parts from attendance at the synod, (on account of their great distance,) it may be inferred that a succession of bishops was for a time maintained. Of the details of their history, however, very little is recorded ; but the fragments which are discoverable, though isolated, are not on that account the less authentic and unmistakable ; and it is a curious confirmation of their genuineness, that for the most part they are preserved, not by Christian but by unbelieving authorities.

What, for example, could be more interesting than the following sketch from an Arab traveller of the ninth century in India, translated by Renandot ? This traveller, named Abou Zeyd Hassan, speaks from the information of a Mussulman merchant of Bassora, who had visited not only the sea-ports of China, but even the then imperial residence, Si-ngan-Fou.

“ In the pages of the Arab writer we find a very curious incident which proves that there existed in China a tolerably accurate knowledge of Jesus Christ and his apostles. The author relates that Ibn Vahab arrived at Si-ngan-Fou, and was introduced into the Imperial palace. The Emperor, after having interrogated him on the affairs of the West, commanded the interpreter to say to him these words, ‘ Should you recognise your master if you were to see him ? The Emperor meant the Apostle of God,—to whom

may God be gracious ! I replied, And how can I see him, since he is now above with the Most High God ?

“The Emperor answered, That is not what I meant ; I was speaking only of his face.’ The Arab then said, ‘Yes ; and there-upon the Emperor ordered a box to be brought and placed before him, and from this he drew some papers, saying to the interpreter, Show him his Master !

“I recognised on these pages, the portraits of the prophets ; and when I did so, I uttered prayers for them, and moved my lips. The Emperor did not know that I recognised the prophets, and told the interpreter to ask me what I moved my lips for. The interpreter did as he was ordered, and I replied, I was praying for the prophets. The Emperor asked how I knew them ; and I answered, By means of the attributes which distinguish them. Thus, here is Noah in his Ark ; he who saved himself with his family, when the Most High commanded the waters to overwhelm the whole earth with its inhabitants : Noah and his family alone escaped. At these words the Emperor began to laugh, and said, You guessed rightly when you said it was Noah ; but as to the submersion of the whole earth, that is a thing we do not admit. The deluge only affected a part of the earth, and not either our country or India.’ Ibn-Vahab reported that he feared to refute what the Emperor had stated by making use of the arguments that he was acquainted with, seeing that the Prince would not have admitted their force. But he resumed, ‘Here is Moses and his staff, with the children of Israel.’

“That is true, said the Emperor ; but Moses showed himself on a very small stage ; and his people were not very well disposed towards him.

“I resumed, Here is Jesus, sitting upon an ass, and surrounded by his Apostles.

“The Emperor said, He, too, had very little time to appear on the stage. His mission did not last more than thirty months.’

“Ibn-Vahab continued to pass the prophets in review ; but we will confine ourselves to a part of what was said. Ibn-Vahab added that above the figure of each prophet there was a long inscription, which he supposed to contain their names, the names of their countries, and the circumstances accompanying their mission. Afterwards he continued thus, ‘I saw the face of the prophet (Mahomet), upon whom be peace ! He was mounted on a camel, and his companions, also on camels, were placed around him. They all wore Arab coverings on their feet, and had tooth-picks at their girdles. As I began to weep, the Emperor desired the interpreter to ask me the cause of my tears. I replied, There is our prophet our Lord, and my cousin, upon him be peace !

“The Emperor answered, You have spoken truly ; he and his people have raised the most glorious empire, only he has not been

able to see with his own eyes the empire he founded. The edifice was only seen by those who came after him.

“I saw the pictures of a great number of other prophets: some were making the sign of a cross by uniting the thumb and fore-finger, as if they meant by this movement to signify some truth. Certain of the figures were represented standing on their feet, and making signs with their fingers towards heaven. There were also other pictures, but the interpreter told me these represented the prophets of India and China.”—Vol. i. pp. 90-3.

This strange collection of the portraits of religious leaders, and the singular juxtaposition of conflicting religious systems which it implies, is a remarkable confirmation of the traditional notions which are entertained regarding the political and religious immobility of the system of state policy in China. The religious indifferentism which it seems to indicate, is precisely the same with that described by Père Huc as the great characteristic of Chinese statesmanship at the present day. The emperor, with whom Ibn-Vahab conversed, Hi-Tsoang, who reigned in 874, is the genuine prototype of the capricious despots who alternately patronized and persecuted the Christian missionaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and one might almost believe that the spirit of religious syncretism which he exhibited in this strange union of Jewish, Christian, Mahomedan, and Buddhist principles and emblems, was inherited from him through lineal descent, by Young-tching, in 1724, who at the very moment when, for reasons of state and from motives of political jealousy, he was issuing instructions for the suppression of the Christian religion throughout the wide range of his dominions, was declaring to the Jesuits that he “believed their law was not a false law.”

It is from an Arab writer also, Mohammed, son of Ishac, surnamed Aboulfarages, that we learn the probable date of the extinction in China of the little community of Christians thus established. “In the year 377 (A.D. 987) I found living in the Christians’ quarter, behind the church, a monk of Nadjran, who seven years before had been sent by the *Djalolik* (Catholic) to China, along with five other ecclesiastics, to set the affairs of Christianity there in order. I saw a man still young, and of an agreeable countenance, but he spoke little, and never opened his mouth but to answer the questions put to him. I asked

him for some information concerning his travels, and he answered that Christianity had become extinct in China.

“The Christians who had been in that country had perished in different ways, the church that had been built for them had been destroyed, and there remained not one single Christian in China. The monk, not having found any one whom he could aid by his ministry, had returned more quickly than he went.’ The Arab writer does not express himself very clearly as to the route the ecclesiastics had followed; but he says that the distance by sea differed according to the way they took, and that the navigation was very troublesome, as few persons could be found acquainted with those latitudes. At the time when the monk visited China, the capital where the sovereign resided was called *Thadjouye*. The empire had previously been divided into two territories; but one of the two competitors for sovereignty had succumbed to the other, who now remained sole master.”

From this period the history is even more obscure. With the fall of the Thang dynasty in the beginning of the tenth century, began a revolution which left so few relics of Christianity behind it, that hardly the faintest trace can be discovered. Père Huc, nevertheless, has contrived to weave together into a very interesting narrative, all the scattered threads which connect the mediæval history of Europe with the remoter kingdoms of the East. The vagueness of the narratives of that period, and the still more hopeless vagueness of its traditions, may be inferred from the fact that the very site of the kingdom of the great hero of eastern mediæval legend, Prester John, was for many generations a problem on which not only divines, but geographers and historians, were divided, some placing it in Abyssinia, some in Tartary, and some in Thibet. Through the many and complicated problems, both of chronology and geography which these questions involved, we have never met so satisfactory or so interesting a guide as Père Huc. He believes Prester John to have been a Khan of the Keraïte Tartars, who was converted by the later Nestorian missionaries; and he conjectures that the name *John* is but a western corruption of the common title *Khan*, borne both by himself and his successors; a conjecture which explains very ingeniously the perpetual recurrence of the legend at many successive periods of the Middle Ages. His priestly cha-

racter was of course founded in the same belief which still lends majesty and holiness to the Talai Lama of La-Ssa. The romantic marvels of Prester John's history give place to the sanguinary realities of the conquests of the terrible Tchinguiz Khan. The ravages of this fierce conqueror extended eastwards through China as far as the Yellow River, whence he carried the fearful scourge of his arms, through Khorassan, Persia, and Georgia, to the shores of the Black Sea, and even to the interior of Bulgaria. His successor, Ogotai, (in 1227,) continued the same warfare. Russia, Poland, and Hungary were successively attacked; and the ferocity of the invaders filled all Europe with alarm. The Popes of the thirteenth century, Honorius III., Gregory IX., and Innocent IV., in vain attempted a defensive organization to resist their progress. At length, where arms were unavailing, a peaceful mission was projected for the conversion and civilization of the dreaded Tartars. Many brethren of the two young orders, the Franciscan and the Dominican, volunteered for the perilous undertaking, and in 1246, two parties set out upon their pilgrimage.

The history of these expeditions, and of the embassy sent by St. Lewis of France in 1248, is detailed with singular clearness and graphic interest by Père Huc. Partly from original materials—the bulls and letters of the Popes, the narratives of the missionaries, the journal of St. Lewis's ambassador, William of Rubruk, (one of the most charming records of travel and adventure in existence,) and many similar documents;—partly from the matured researches of modern historians;—he has contrived to bring together a mass of information which it would be in vain to seek elsewhere, and which, obscure as is the subject, leaves little to be desired. Some of the missionary records—the letters of John of Monte Corvino, of Andrea di Perugia, of Pascal of Spain, and above all, of Oderic of Friuli, are among the most interesting monuments of religious zeal and enterprise which can be found in the whole range of history. We would gladly transcribe more than one of these touching narratives if space permitted, but we must be content to refer our readers to Père Huc's own pages for these and many other interesting details.

We cannot, however, resist the temptation of extracting the following curious description from the pen of Oderic of Friuli, a Franciscan missionary of the fourteenth century,

of one of those Buddhist hospitals for the reception of old or invalided animals which still form in European eyes one of the marvels of Indian Buddhism. The convent in which Oderic witnessed this singular sight was at Han-Tcheon-Fou.

"One day, the Christian neophyte said to me, 'Father, will you come and have the pleasure of an excursion into the town?' 'Willingly,' answered I. He immediately sent for a boat, we entered it, and went to visit a great monastery of Bonzes. The Christian neophyte, having called one of these Bonzes, said to him, 'Do you see this Frank priest? he comes from the regions where the sun sets, and he is now going to Khanbalik to pray for the life of the emperor. Show him some rarity of our country, in order that he may say, when he shall one day return into his own land, 'I saw at Han-Tcheon-Fou, such or such a curious thing.' 'I will show him,' said the Bonze, 'the wonder of our monastery.' There were, in a corner of the apartment, several baskets filled with the fragments of the repast of the community. The Bonze took them, and, having opened a door, introduced us into a magnificent park, in the midst of which arose a hill planted with beautiful trees. We stopped at the foot of the hill; the Bonze struck several times on a tam-tam, and at the sound we perceived a number of animals, of various species, hastening down towards us. The greater number resembled apes and cats; there were, at least, three thousand of them: all these animals ranged themselves in order, and the old Buddhist priest distributed to them the fragments from the convent repast. When all had eaten according to their appetite, at the first stroke of the tam-tam they quietly began to climb up the side of the hill again, and disappeared into their dens. This sight was so strange that I could not help laughing heartily: at length I said to the old man, 'Tell me the meaning of what I have just seen.' 'You have just seen,' said he, 'the souls of illustrious men, whom we feed for the love of God.' 'These cats, these apes, these dogs, all these beasts,' answered I, 'are not spiritual souls—they are merely animals.' 'No,' said the Bonze, 'they are not beasts; they are the souls of the dead. Noble souls, after this life, pass into the bodies of noble animals, and the souls of peasants inhabit the bodies of the vilest beasts.' 'It was in vain I preached,' adds brother Oderic; 'I found it impossible to argue him out of his superstition.'

"It is known that Buddhists admit the doctrine of metempsychosis: they are persuaded that the souls of beasts have formerly been human souls; and hence arises the respect of Buddhist devotees for animals, and the minute precaution which they take for fear of hurting them. It was not therefore surprising to see, in a monastery of Bonzes, animals of all kinds, tamed, caressed and petted, assembling at the sound of the tam-tam to take their meals, and

constituting, in some measure, a part of the religious community. The old Bonze of the convent of Han-Teheou-Fou might be sincere in his belief, and might really think himself surrounded by friends, when he was in the midst of the apes and cats of his own park ; and it is even probable that he might have repulsed, as impieties, the exhortations of the Franciscan brother."—Vol. i. pp. 366-7.

It will easily be understood that the limited and casual intercourse which missionary enterprise maintained with the east, was insufficient to bring the two races into mutual intercommunion. On the contrary, when, after the momentous revolutions which the conquests of Tchinguiz Khan, Kublai Khan, and Tamerlane brought in their train, and in which whatever little Christian remnant might have outlived the earlier storms, was swept away, the later missionaries penetrated into the further regions of Asia, they were struck with wonder by the many analogies with Christianity which the Buddhist religion there established, appeared to present:—numerously peopled monasteries; rigid celibacy; strict and indeed excessive asceticism; solemn processions; religious fêtes; a pontifical court; colleges of superior Lamas electing their ecclesiastical sovereign and spiritual father; and in a word, a vast and comprehensive organization in many respects analogous to that which they had left behind them in the Church of their fathers.

The missionaries' report of this striking similarity between the institutions of the Buddhism of the distant East, and those of the Christian Church, which was confirmed by Marco Polo and the other Venetian explorers, naturally occasioned much speculation among the scholars of the West. Whence these numerous and startling analogies? Which of the two systems was to be regarded as the original of the other? Or were both to be believed to be expressions of one common type, modified in their details by peculiarities of race, of nationality, or of conventional usage?

To the scepticism of the eighteenth century these strange coincidences of Buddhist and Christian ceremonial supplied an attractive and not unpopular topic. "The anti-Christian philosophers, Voltaire, Volney, Bailly and others, seized upon these analogies with eagerness, as a valuable discovery. They pretended at first, in the name of science, that mankind, with all their languages, their arts, and religious beliefs, descended originally from the

mountains of Thibet ; there was the cradle of science and faith, whence they had flowed successively through China, India and Egypt, and spread at last into Europe.

"This first point established, by means of a good deal of audacity and a little superficial and mistaken erudition, they talked of Buddhism and the Grand Lama with an affectation of mystery ; they published a number of dissertations on the Lama hierarchy, with some apparently indulgent, but in reality treacherous, reservations ; and as in that enlightened age it could not be permitted to hide the light of truth under a bushel, they then asserted boldly that Christianity was the offspring of Buddhism, and that the Catholic worship was founded on the practices of the Lamas."

Père Huc discusses with great acuteness the foundations of this specious theory. He demonstrates, with all the evidence of history, that these fancied original institutions of Buddhism are in reality but modern reforms and modifications of that system, introduced at a comparatively recent period ; and that in truth they are *all, or nearly all, posterior to the conquest of Kublai-Khan*, and to the great *Franciscan and Dominican missions* of the thirteenth century. He shews further, that, by the traditions of Thibet, the reforms of Buddhism, which are the foundations of those striking Christian analogies, are attributed to a supernatural personage named Tsong-Kaba, *the date of whose career exactly coincides with the period of these missions*. Now this Tsong Kaba is represented by the Buddhist legend as having derived his learning from "the Lamas of the West ;" and Père Huc conjectures, with great probability that the "Lamas of the West" indicated by the tradition, are no other than the Latin Missionaries of the thirteenth century.

"Even a slight examination of Tsong-Kaba's reforms and innovations will suffice to show their resemblance to Catholicism. We have already spoken of the striking analogy between the government of the Grand Lama and that of the States of the Church. During our residence among the Buddhists of Thibet, we remarked, besides the cross, the mitre, the dalmatic, and the chasuble that the superior lamas carry with them, when travelling, or performing some ceremony out of the temple, the choral service, the exorcisms, the censers supported by five chains, and made to open and shut, the blessings which the lamas bestow on the faithful, laying their hand upon the head of the suppliant, the rosary, the practice of

ecclesiastical celibacy, of spiritual retreats, the worship of saints, fasts, processions, holy water, litanies, and many other details of ceremonial, which are in use among the Buddhists, precisely as in our own Church, and are evidently of Christian origin.

"At the time when the Buddhist patriarchs established themselves in Thibet, all the countries of Northern Asia numbered Christians among their inhabitants. We have seen that the Catholic missionaries founded many flourishing colonies in China, Tartary, Turkestan, and even among the nomadic tribes of Thibet, who were converted by Oderic de Friuli. In their apostolic wanderings, the monks carried with them the paraphernalia of the Church; and they performed the ceremonies of their religion before the Mongol princes, who received them hospitably, and suffered them to erect chapels even within the precincts of their palaces; and they were thus enabled to witness and admire the pomp of Christian worship. The envoys of the Mongol conquerors, too, visited the capital of the Christian world several times, and assisted at the second œcumenic council of Lyons in 1274. These barbarians must have been greatly struck with the splendour of the Catholic religion, and have carried back to their wilderness an indelible impression of its grandeur. The new dignity of the Buddhist patriarchs being founded at this epoch, it is not surprising that, desirous of augmenting the number of their sect, they should have sought to increase the magnificence of their worship by adopting some of those splendid ceremonies of the Christian service which attract the multitude, and even have introduced into their system something of that ecclesiastical organization with which the missionaries had made them acquainted.

"Is not the legend of Tsong Kaba, which we have ourselves heard in his native country from many of the lamas, a striking proof of the Christian origin of the Buddhist Reform?

"Stripping the narrative of all the marvellous details added to it by the imagination of the lamas, it is easy to suppose that Tsong Kaba was a man remarkable for intellect and virtue, that he was instructed by a stranger who came from the West; that after the death of the master the disciple, turning his steps westward, arrived at the capital of Thibet, where he taught the doctrines which he had imbibed. The stranger *with the large nose* may have been one of the numerous Catholic missionaries who at that time appeared in China, Tartary, and Thibet, and it is not surprising that tradition should have preserved the remembrance of the European face, so different from the familiar Asiatic type. Whilst living in Amdo, the native country of Tsong Kaba, we often heard the lamas making remarks on our strange faces, and declaring without hesitation, that we must come from the same country as Tsong Kaba's instructor.

"A premature death may have prevented the Catholic missionary from completing the religious instruction of his disciple, who

afterwards wishing to become himself an apostle, and either being but half acquainted with the Christian dogma, or having seceded from his faith, merely introduced a new liturgy. The slight opposition which he met with would seem to indicate that the progress of Christianity in those parts had already affected the stability of the religion of Buddha.

"The coincidence of time and place, as well as the testimony of history and tradition, all point to the fact, that the lama hierarchy borrowed largely from Christianity."—Vol. ii. pp. 15-18.

The modern period of missionary enterprise in China, beginning with the expeditions of the Portuguese under Vasco de Gama, in 1497, forms the subject of *Père Huc's* second volume.

"At that time, not far from Lisbon, might be seen a rustic chapel, which the Infante Don Enrico had built upon the seashore in honour of the Virgin, to animate the devotion of the sailors, and to ensure them her protection.

"One day towards the end of July 1497, there knelt, at the foot of that statue of the Virgin, a party of men, whose tanned complexions and energetic faces showed them strangers to idleness and ease. They passed the night in prayer; and the next day, after hearing mass, and communicating with fervour, they returned to Lisbon in procession, each one carrying a taper, and chanting hymns and psalms, accompanied by priests, monks, and an immense concourse of people drawn together by the novelty of the spectacle. These men were Vasco da Gama and his companions, preparing to brave the perils of an unknown sea. Diaz had given so terrible an account of the Cape of Storms, that all these sailors were looked upon as so many victims, destined to almost inevitable destruction. Their procession was regarded almost as a funeral array; and the crowd melted into tears at the sight of the youth and manly vigour which was bidding adieu to its native land, to rush into a sadly-certain doom. Thus were the adventurers escorted to the port; and here, throwing themselves on their knees, they received general absolution as for death, and embarked amid the cries and lamentations of the people. The bold adventurers then set sail with a favourable wind, and were soon lost to view on the vast plain of waters.

"Before a year had elapsed, Vasco da Gama had planted the Christian cross and the flag of Portugal on the coast of Malabar."—Vol. ii. pp. 18-19.

The discovery of India, and of the Nestorian missions, there existing, stimulated the religious as well as the scientific enterprise of the Portuguese explorers. An expedition, under the command of Ferdinand d'Andrada, was

speedily undertaken (1518) in search, by the new and maritime route, of that Cathay, which Marco Polo had reached over the countless and inhospitable deserts of Central Asia. The zeal of the missionary kept pace with the enterprise of the explorer, or more properly outran it; and long before the foot of commerce had penetrated the coast of China, the miraculous successes of the great St. Francis Xavier were won on the very threshold of that land of mystery. Death, however, summoned him, too soon for the hopes of Western Christendom, to his heavenly crown; and the first European who, in modern times, actually effected an entrance, was a Dominican of Evora, Gaspard de la Croix, one of the twelve Friar-Preachers who first left Portugal for India. The very earliest symptom of his success, however, alarmed the Chinese authorities; and he had hardly inaugurated the work of the Gospel when he was arrested and banished from the country.

For the Jesuit Society was reserved the glory of really opening this long-closed kingdom to the influence at once of the civilization and the religious enlightenment of the West.

The first instruments of this great conquest were two Italian fathers, Michael Roger, a Neapolitan, and Matthew Ricci, of Macerata. The latter, especially, was a man of very remarkable character.

"Ricci was born at Macerata, near Ancona, in the same year that St. Francis Xavier yielded up his breath in the humble hut on the Chinese island. Thus, at the very time that the apostle who had conceived the project of Christianising China was expiring in the heart of Asia, there arose at the other extremity of the world the missionary destined to execute the scheme. The apostolic zeal of Xavier seemed to have passed into the soul of Ricci, who had been originally destined to the law, but, preferring a religious life, entered the Society of Jesus in 1571.

"During his novitiate, he was under the tuition of Valignani, who eventually accomplished so much in the Indies, that a prince of Portugal called him the Apostle of the East. After the departure of his master on the foreign missions, Ricci felt a desire to follow him; and only remained in Europe long enough to complete the studies necessary for his enterprise, reaching Goa in 1578. He was twenty-seven years of age when he entered the apostolic career."—Vol. ii. p. 38.

The Jesuit fathers at first confined their labours to the island of Ngao-men, on which the Portuguese had obtained

permission to establish themselves in a small town which they there founded—the same which afterwards rose to such vast commercial importance under the name of Macao. An opportunity, however, at length offered of penetrating to the main land, on occasion of an embassy to the viceroy of the province of Kouang-Si, in which Father Roger represented the bishop of Macao, who, with the governor, had been summoned to Tchao-king, the capital of the province. Although disappointed at first in their hope of being allowed to settle at Tchao-king, the ambassadors received permission to return from Macao with presents for the viceroy; but owing to a sudden illness, Roger was unable to accompany the expedition.

“The zealous missionary was all the more vexed at this, because he had intended to propitiate the governor by the present of a handsome clock, which Father Ricci had brought from Goa.

“On learning the illness of Father Roger, the viceroy appeared grieved; but when he heard of the marvellous machine which, by means of an ingenious system of wheels, went of itself, and marked the hours with perfect precision, he became tormented with a longing to see and possess this prodigy, and desired his secretary to write directly to Macao to invite Father Roger to come to Tchao-King as soon as his health would permit.

“The arrival of this dispatch was an event for all the little Portuguese colony, and transports of joy burst forth on all sides, particularly in the Jesuit establishment. The letter of the viceroy granted the request which Roger had made at his first visit, and the monks were formally authorised, by letters patent, to erect a house and a church in Tchao-King. Valignani was the only one who did not share the general enthusiasm. He was quite astounded at this unexpected success; ‘and he would have let slip the occasion,’ says Trigault, ‘if the other fathers had not unanimously advised him to seize such an opportunity.’

“The viceroy was so impatient to see Father Roger, or rather to possess the clock of which he had heard, that he sent his secretary to Macao with a mandarin junk to receive the missionary, and conduct him with distinction to Tchao-King.

“These precious marks of friendship were eagerly accepted, and on the 18th December, 1582, Roger embarked, accompanied by Francesco Pasco, another Jesuit who was not yet in holy orders, and several young Chinese.

“The viceroy's secretary was astonished to see him thus escorted, knowing that he alone had been invited; but Roger told him that, as a priest, he was not accustomed to go about alone, and that it was necessary he should take with him two members of his order, one to accompany him in his visits to the viceroy, the other to keep

house in his absence. This reply was accepted, and the junk set sail with its freight of missionaries, carrying with them the good wishes of all the Christians of Macao. The viceroy was enraptured on witnessing the working of the clock, and no doubt he thought, at the bottom of his Chinese conscience, that men who could invent such marvellous things were not quite such barbarians as they looked. He wished to show them his gratitude by presents, but the missionaries courteously declined his gifts. They assured him that their only ambition was to be allowed to reside in his country; that their profession was to serve God and cultivate the sciences, that they had heard of the intelligence, laws, customs, manners, and knowledge of the Chinese, and had not hesitated to quit their native land, and undertake a weary voyage of three years, that they might come and learn of them; and their studies, they added, would be much better carried on in the interior of the empire than at Macao. The viceroy thought it a great honour for the Chinese that such men should come so far to live among them; and as he piqued himself on cultivating philosophy and mathematics, in which the missionaries were versed, he agreed to their wishes, and assigned to them as their residence a Buddhist temple in the environs of the town. He often sent them provisions from the palace, and granted them frequent private audiences.

"The civil and military functionaries, and all the important personages of Tchao-King, moved either by curiosity or by a wish to please the viceroy, paid frequent visits to the pagoda of the Catholic monks; and thus by degrees the vast empire, so long hermetically sealed to foreigners, appeared opening to the zeal and devotion of the preachers of the gospel. Father Roger had already composed a catechism in Chinese, and translated 'The Lives of the Saints,' in order that Christian ideas might be communicated to the populace. He had obtained the viceroy's consent to Father Ricci also establishing himself at Tchao-King, and everything appeared to smile upon their efforts, when suddenly an unlooked for event again destroyed all their hopes."—Vol. ii. pp. 41, 44.

The event to which Père Huc alludes was the deposition of the friendly governor. The last act of this governor was to request that they would leave Tchao-King, lest their being found there by his successor should but deepen his own disgrace. They were compelled accordingly to return to Macao.

Most unexpectedly, however, the new viceroy invited them some time afterwards to return, and even to settle at Tchao-King; and from this moment their prospects began to brighten. As they gradually acquired facility in speaking the language, they advanced in favour among the learned.

The well-known expedient by which Ricci, in con-

structing a map of the world, accommodated himself to the popular Chinese notions of topography is thus related by Père Huc.

“‘Father Ricci being well versed in mathematics, which he had learned from Christopher Clavius, the prince of the mathematicians of his century, applied himself to the construction of this map, which suited well with his design of preaching the Gospel, knowing that the same means cannot be employed to attract different nations to the faith of Jesus Christ. In truth, by this decoy, many Chinese were drawn to the bosom of the Church. This map was of large dimensions, the better to contain the Chinese characters, which are larger than ours, as well as many annotations, which he thought suitable to his purpose, and to the humour of the Chinese; for in various places, in treating of the manners and customs of different nations he found an opportunity of discoursing on the sacred mysteries of our holy faith, until this time unknown to the Chinese, in order that the fame of it might be quickly spread abroad by every one. I will not either omit to mention a contrivance of his to gain the good graces of the Chinese. They believe that the sky is round, but the earth square, and that their empire is situated in the midst of it; and they are for this reason very angry, when they find our geographers, in their maps, putting it in a corner of the extreme East. Now they are not capable of understanding any mathematical demonstration, by which it might be proved to them, that the earth and the sea together form a globe and that by the nature of the spherical figure there can be neither beginning nor end to it. He, therefore, altered a little our plan for maps of the world, and by placing the first meridian of the Fortunate Islands at the margin, right and left, he brought the empire of China into the centre, to their great satisfaction.’ After this account, Father Trigault adds, with much naïveté, ‘Truly one could not at that time have found an invention more calculated to dispose this people to receive the mysteries of our religion.’

“In fact, this map, though somewhat irregular in its structure, might have been very useful in contributing to destroy a prejudice which has always been one of the chief causes of the hatred of the Chinese towards strangers. From the earliest times, they have always fancied, that the fixed purpose of the Europeans in coming to China, was to seize upon their empire. Now a mere glance at the map of the world might tend to diminish this fear, by showing the enormous distance that separates it from the countries of the West; the danger would not then appear so imminent, nor the presence of a few foreigners on the coasts give rise to so vivid an alarm.

“The impression produced by this map was a great encouragement to Father Ricci, and he pursued with much ability this method of obtaining influence by constructing terrestrial and celes-

tial spheres, both in copper and iron ; and he also made sundials to mark the hours, and presented them to the first magistrates of the cities, so that he acquired a prodigious reputation, and was soon regarded as the most learned man that had ever existed in astronomy, or, as the Chinese say, in 'Celestial Literature' (Tien Wien)."—Vol. ii. pp. 68-70.

It is hardly necessary to add, that in the hands of Ricci and his companions, science, and especially mathematical and astronomical science, became a powerful instrument of propagandism.

"When they were fairly installed and secure of the protection of the magistrates, they resolved to devote themselves to the preaching of the gospel, by what may seem rather a round-about method. They thought it advisable to try and gain credit and influence in the first instance by their skill in mathematics. 'God,' says Father Trigault, 'has not throughout all ages made use of the same method to draw men to His law ; and we need not be surprised if our brethren (the Jesuits) made use of this bait to attract fish to their net. Whoever wishes to banish from the Chinese Church physical science, mathematics, and moral philosophy, knows little of the Chinese mind, which refuses wholesome medicine prepared without any of these condiments.' Now there was no one thing by which Father Ricci could so powerfully rouse the attention of Chinese philosophers, as by the newest European science, supported, as it was, by irrefragable proofs.

"Father Ricci had found the Chinese plunged in the grossest errors in astronomy, geography, and physical science in general, and he hoped that, by showing these self-sufficient, literary men the gross absurdities of which they had been victims, in their pretended science, he might perhaps lead them to admit that they were equally in need of instruction in religion. This method appeared plausible and easy. The Chinese declared the heavens to be round, but the earth square ; and they explained eclipses in various ways. Some said that the moon was so impudently stared at by the sun, that she became embarrassed and frightened, and at last dark ; others declared there was a large hole in the middle of the sun, and that when the moon was just opposite this hole, she could receive no rays of light.

"The Tao-Sse, or doctors of reason, gave a still simpler account of the phenomenon. There was, they said, in the skies, a gigantic goddess, who had but to stretch out her right hand to hide the sun, and her left to hide the moon ; and that was the whole secret of eclipses. As for the elements, they admitted five ; which reciprocally engendered each other;—they were fire, water, earth, metal, and wood.

"It was certainly not difficult for Father Ricci to offer to the

Chinese theories approaching a little nearer to common sense than this farago of nonsense, but unfortunately he had not always very incontestable truths to put in the place of their absurdities, and after having rejected their five elements, he gave them in exchange four. The missionaries of our day have been sometimes considerably embarrassed when the Chinese talked to them of Father Ricci's four elements, and other physical theories which were found interwoven with his moral and doctrinal works.

"But though attended with some inconveniences, the method adopted by the first apostles of the Chinese empire was well calculated to gain them credit and consideration; though also it must be owned to excite the jealousy of the learned and the mandarins. Every Chinese at Nankin who had the smallest tincture of letters now made a point of getting introduced to these great masters from the West, and nothing was talked of but astronomy, geography, and mathematics. Euclid had dethroned Confucius, and the Chinese threw aside their classical books, to occupy themselves in making maps, spheres, and sun dials. It was quite a rage among them—a monomania.

"Nankin possessed an observatory, situated on a mountain at one of the extremities of the town; beyond the ramparts and on the declivity of this mountain were magnificent habitations, where resided the '*Celestial Literati*,' for this is the designation of astronomers in China. During the whole night these celestial functionaries keep watch and ward at the top of their tower, overlook the conduct of the stars, and give notice to the emperor of any extraordinary phenomenon that may attract their attention.

"When Father Ricci visited the observatory, he was not a little surprised to find in it metal globes of colossal size, dials, astrolobes, and several mathematical instruments, which, though essentially defective, nevertheless manifested some true scientific ideas in their makers. The Chinese informed him that these curious machines dated from the time of the Mongol occupation, namely, the thirteenth century, and it is therefore highly probable that foreigners, Europeans or Arabs, were the authors of these remarkable works.

"The observatory of Peking possessed some instruments of a similar kind, and of the same dimensions, and the Fathers felt convinced they had been made at the same time, and by the same persons.

"Within a short time Father Ricci had acquired considerable influence among the higher classes of Nankin, and it became quite the fashion to be his partizan and apologist. The literary men in particular did not hesitate to declare themselves in his favour; in a great measure because he had attacked with complete success the doctrines of the Bonzes and doctors of reason; as well as because he always professed much respect and admiration for the teaching of Confucius. The European doctor was, in their eyes, a member of the corporation of the lettered—a follower of Confucius,

a partisan of their own doctrines, an enemy alike of the superstitions of the Buddhists and the reveries of the sectaries of Lao-Tze."—Vol. ii. pp. 133-6.

During their second visit to Tchao-King, they made many converts.

"Tchao-King, a town of great importance both in a commercial and political point of view, is situated on the banks of a great river, constantly furrowed by the passage to and fro of crowds of junks. Almost all the mandarins of the South, who are going to, or returning from Peking, pass this way; and the house and church of the Jesuits, built outside the fortifications of the town, and close to the water side, naturally attract the attention of all who navigate the 'Tiger River.' Almost all the travellers who passed by Tchao-King, and especially the mandarins and the 'lettered,' were in the habit of paying a visit to the residence of the religious men of the West; and all were curious to see closely the faces of the strangers, of whom such wonderful things were told. They wanted to look at those clocks which struck the hours of themselves, those maps which described all the countries of the earth, those pictures painted with such astonishing perfection, that the persons in them appeared alive; and that mass of curiosities unknown to the people of the Flowery Kingdom. The mandarins and the lettered men of China were obliged to admit, when they had seen these things, that the barbarians of the West had some glimmer of intelligence; and that even beyond the limits of the Celestial Empire, there were nations who cultivated industry and the arts with some little success. Father Ricci, too, had made himself familiar with the language of China, and interested and amused them so much by his conversation, that they could not but allow that the 'Western Devil' had almost sense enough for a Chinese.

"The frequent visits paid to them tended much to increase the renown of these men of Europe and their possessions. The visitors felt more inclined to listen to the religious instruction which the missionaries always found means to introduce into their conversation; and thus, by the grace of God, the divine seed was sown, which germinated in many a heart, and bore fruit unto salvation. It was at the mission of Tchao-King that many mandarins, who became grand dignitaries of the empire, received their first notions of Christianity, which they subsequently embraced and practised with fervour, as we shall hereafter have occasion to tell. Some families of distinction at Tchao-King even received baptism; and the number of neophytes was at length found so considerable, that the services of the Catholic Church were publicly and regularly performed."—Vol. ii. pp. 86-8.

In the midst of this seeming prosperity, by one of those

capricious changes of policy which, then as now, characterized this jealous race, they were suddenly expelled from Tchao-King, and compelled to take their departure; but in the end Father Ricci received permission to settle at Tchao-Tcheou, a city near the frontiers of the province. At this city he was joined by a neophyte of considerable note.

"Tchao-Tcheou had lately lost one of its great notabilities, namely, the famous Kiu, a man of distinguished learning, who had held the highest offices and exercised a decisive influence in all the most important affairs of the country. His son Kiu-Tai-Sse had followed the literary career with the most brilliant success; but a love of dissipation had afterwards induced him to abandon all serious study, and he had devoted himself with passionate ardour to alchemy.

"The rich inheritance that his father had left him was soon dispersed in smoke through his crucibles and alembics, and he then adopted a kind of nomadic life, and traversed all the provinces of the empire, pitching his tent wherever he could find any friends of his father, who, for his father's sake, were generally willing to afford him a welcome.

"He had sojourned in this way for a time at Tchao-King, and had made acquaintance with the missionaries, to whom he became a very frequent visitor, as he had heard the report that these strangers from the West knew how to transform the commonest metals into gold and silver.

"One day Father Ricci was peaceably engaged at his new abode in Tchao-Tcheou, translating Euclid's Elements into Chinese, when Kiu-Tai-Sse made his appearance. He was attired in a rich costume of ceremony, and accompanied by several attendants solemnly bearing presents covered with flowers and ribbons. Kiu-Tai-Sse prostrated himself before the missionary, struck the ground three times with his forehead, and said, 'Master! suffer me to be your disciple!' This is a customary ceremony with the Chinese when they choose a master; so the next day there was a splendid banquet, and Kiu-Tai-Sse was adopted as a disciple accordingly.

"His passion for the occult sciences and the secrets of alchemy, had, however, been the real inducements to this step; but, after having for some time frequented the company of the missionaries, he found that though they were certainly in possession of that philosopher's stone of religious truth which is capable of effecting the most wonderful transformations of the intellect and the heart, they were incapable of manufacturing the smallest morsel of gold or silver.

"Kiu-Tai-Sse had applied himself in the first instance to the study of mathematics, geometry, and mechanics, under the direc-

tion of Father Ricci, and made very rapid progress, and even, it is said, became capable of constructing instruments and writing on scientific subjects with clearness, elegance, and precision. To the study of religion he devoted no less attention than to that of the sciences, and carried into it the clearness and correctness of thought which the study of mathematics often gives.

"He had prepared, among other things, a table with three columns, in the first of which were placed the religious and moral instructions of Father Ricci; in the next the objections that occurred to him; and the third he left blank to receive the master's explanations. He was subsequently admitted to the rite of baptism; and the conversion brought great renown to the mission, for Kiu-Tai-Sse, on account of his reputation as a learned man, exercised a considerable influence over public opinion; and the house at Tchao-Tcheou soon became the rendezvous of the literary men and first functionaries of the province."—Vol. ii. pp. 100-102.

While Father Ricci was at Tchao-Tcheou, a prospect offered (in 1595) of penetrating to the capital of the Empire, Peking, in the suite of one of the principal mandarins, who desired to obtain the benefit of his medical advice for a sick child, Ricci eagerly embraced the invitation.

It had long been evident, however, that he had in the first instance committed a great mistake in adopting at first the dress of the bonzes, or Buddhist priests—a class universally despised in China. All the disgrace and unpopularity of this order attach in the eyes of the public to their characteristic costume. Before setting out for Peking accordingly, Father Ricci resolved to lay it aside and to adopt the dress of the Lettered Class in its stead.

This first attempt to reach Peking proved a failure. The junk in which they embarked wrecked, and several other mishaps befell them. These misfortunes the mandarin ascribed to Father Ricci's presence; and he dismissed him from his retinue, giving him letters, however, which enabled him to reach Nankin. In this city he met an old acquaintance, on whose assistance, or at least countenance he thought he might reckon.

"Father Ricci chose for himself a modest lodging in the suburbs of the city, and resolved to wait in calm seclusion till Providence should allow him to see some favourable opportunity for coming forward and proclaiming to this population of learned sceptics the good tidings of the Gospel. He soon learned that one of the principal magistrates of Nankin was one of his old Canton friends, the Mandarin Hia, for whom he had made a globe and some sundials.

He went, therefore, to pay him a visit, hoping he might not have forgotten their acquaintance and his former expressions of friendship.

"The grand Mandarin Hia received Father Ricci with measured courtesy and in a manner perfectly conformable to the 'rites,' and then inquired by what chance he found himself at Nankin, and what important affair had brought him there. 'I remembered you,' answered Father Ricci, 'and could not resist the desire to pay you a visit. Here are official letters from the Grand Military Intendant, who has authorized me to come and see you at Nankin.' On hearing these words, and especially on seeing the letters, the mandarin seemed to be thrown into the greatest consternation, and he could not repress his displeasure. 'What rashness!' he exclaimed—'What madness! Your heart has misled your reason! At Canton I treated you with benevolence, and now you come to ruin me at Nankin! Nankin is not a town where a stranger can live: your presence will excite a tumult: you will be the occasion of a riot, and they will accuse me of having caused it! My enemies will point me out to my superiors as a man who keeps up a secret communication with barbarians and endeavours to bring them into the Central empire. My future prospects are ruined; I shall be irrevocably lost, and all because of you!'—and by way of conclusion to these friendly speeches, the mandarin turned Father Ricci out of doors, and desired he would leave the town immediately, and go, he did not care where.

"The poor missionary retired, terribly disconcerted at this rough reception, and he had scarcely got home before a party of soldiers came and seized the owner of the house and dragged him before the tribunal. Father Ricci's old friend thought proper, it seems, to vent some of his anger upon this unfortunate Chinese: he ordered him to be beaten with bamboos till he was covered with blood, and told him that by keeping up secret communication with strangers he had committed a crime that the law punished with death; and that if he wished to atone for his fault he must drive this barbarian from his house, or his presence would assuredly bring him some worse misfortune.

"Father Ricci could not of course resist a storm of this violence, but yielded to it with resignation, and, after a tedious and troublesome voyage, reached Nan-Tchoung-Fou, the capital of Kiang-Si."

—Vol. ii. pp. 107-109.

Soon after his return Father Ricci was appointed Superior-general of the Missions in China. In 1598 he made another ineffectual attempt to obtain a footing at Pekin. Accompanied by Father Cataneo, he reached the city in safety under the protection of the President of the Supreme Court: but after a short stay in which little of importance

was effected, they were obliged to return. Fortunately, however, they were suffered to settle at Nankin, where a residence was assigned to them under very peculiar circumstances.

"The president of the court of public works came to pay a visit to the missionaries; and when he had complimented Father Ricci on the triumph he had obtained in the presence of the men of letters, *he expressed the earnest desire entertained by the magistrates of Nankin that he should settle permanently in that city.* Father Ricci declared that this was his desire also, and that he was only waiting to see whether he should be able to buy a suitable house. The president of public works thereupon informed him that he would willingly place at his disposal, in the name of the state, a palace that had been built some years before for the residence of a magistrate, but which was at present uninhabited on account of being haunted by evil spirits (or Kony). The Bonzes and doctors of reason had gone many times and practised the most approved ceremonies of exorcism; and various persons had attempted to live in it, but had always been obliged to decamp pretty quickly, for there were perpetually strange noises and plaintive moanings, and in the night terrific apparitions.

"The whole town knew that this palace was the favourite resort of demons, and the very neighbourhood in which it was situated was overwhelmed with terror and consternation. Father Ricci said he would gladly go and see this residence, and if it suited him would make no difficulty about buying it, being quite persuaded that the evil spirits, if there were any, would take flight as soon as he should have placed in it the image of the true God.

"This palace, which had been built but a very short time, was capable of accommodating ten missionaries, and in other respects particularly well adapted for a religious house. The price having been fixed at one half of what it had cost to build, Father Ricci did not hesitate a moment about the purchase, and did not concern himself in the least on the subject of the diabolic apparitions; for besides that the house was an excellent bargain; it was a point of the highest importance to the security of the mission, to possess premises sold thus by an authentic act of the president of public works. This fact alone constituted a legal authorisation, and would serve to cut short many future intrigues of the petty mandarins or jealous men of letters. *The contract of sale was signed and sealed by the president, and the missionaries with great joy installed themselves in their palace, though not without having previously sprinkled it well with holy water.* They never heard any unpleasant noises, nor saw the smallest sign of a ghost, and from that time all Nankin was talking, not only of the knowledge of these foreign doctors, but of their power over evil spirits; and it was inferred also that their religion must be a holy one, since

their presence was thus sufficient to silence and put to flight a whole army of demons.

"This event did not fail to make a great impression on the Chinese, and disposed them strongly in favour of the European ecclesiastics."— Vol. ii. pp. 139-140.

The literary habits of the Nankinese enabled Father Ricci to turn to better advantage than on any former occasion his mathematical and astronomical attainments; and it was to the curiosity excited in the court of Peking, by the report of their extraordinary acquirements, and especially to the fame of certain "wonderful clocks, striking the hours of themselves," which they were reported to possess the secret of constructing, that they were indebted for this final admission to Peking, where they arrived in January 1601.

"Father Ricci's presents were sent to court, and excited general admiration. The great pictures, it was said, had caused some alarm, from the faces being so natural and the eyes so full of animation; but the clocks roused to the utmost the curiosity of the emperor and his court. Unluckily they were a little out of order, and did not go quite regularly, but three eunuchs were appointed to learn the art of winding them up; and a special office was created for the discharge of this great duty.

"A residence was assigned to the missionaries in the immediate vicinity of the court; for although they were not admitted to the presence of the Son of Heaven, he liked to converse with them and question them concerning the manners and customs of Europeans, and he carried on these singular conversations by the intervention of his eunuchs, who went backwards and forwards continually.

"In order to enable the emperor and his court to understand many details more clearly than they could do by verbal explanations, often ill reported, concerning the customs of the West, Father Ricci sent a collection of figures, representing the costumes of the sovereigns and people of rank in Europe, as well as views of the most remarkable public edifices. Among others were views of the Escorial in Spain, and St. Mark's in Venice, and one of the eunuchs told the missionaries that the emperor on seeing these lofty edifices had been touched with compassion for the melancholy case of the unfortunate monarchs who occupied them, and who were evidently obliged to climb up ladders to get to their apartments, a practice that he considered by no means pleasant, and decidedly dangerous.

"Our mode of building houses several stories high, is generally much objected to by the Chinese. They say the countries of the West must be very poor and very small, to oblige people to live in this way, piled upon one another.

"Among the other presents offered to the emperor, was a spinnet, but as there were no instructions for playing on it, the missionaries had to give some lessons to the eunuchs. They even composed a set of airs adapted to the taste of the country, and set them to Chinese words, and the collection became very popular in the Chinese capital, under the name of '*Songs of the Spinnet*.' These indefatigable preachers of the gospel were, as we see, perpetually engaged in all kinds of occupations, and they were constantly giving lessons to these eunuchs, sometimes in geography, sometimes in music, and sometimes in clockmaking. Like the great apostle of nations, they made themselves 'all things to all men,' to gain all for Jesus Christ."—Vol. ii. pp. 151-2.

There is an amusing mixture of cunning and humour in the device by which the emperor secured himself against the danger of being obliged to surrender one of these highly prized time-pieces.

"The emperor was enchanted with these marvellous contrivances, and the eunuchs related that when the empress mother, who had heard much of them, requested her son to send her one to look at, the Son of Heaven seemed quite struck with consternation, fearing that when his mother had had the delight of hearing it strike, she would wish to keep it. As he could not well refuse his mother's request, and yet could not bear the thoughts of giving her one of his clocks, the cunning celestial majesty bethought him of playing the old lady a trick, and accordingly sent her the clocks, but took the precaution first to have the striking movements stopped. The empress mother, therefore, when she got the plaything was a little disappointed in it, and soon got tired of it, and sent it back to her son."—Vol. ii. p. 159.

The influence of court favour soon told upon the fortunes of the young mission.

"While the mission of Peking was thus prosperous, those of Nankin, Nan-Tchang-Fou, and Tchao-Tcheou, after languishing for some years under the indifference or ill-will of the people, seemed suddenly to have received a new impulse, and the joyful news that had arrived from the capital contributed not a little to aid their progress. When the mandarins heard that the Western strangers were preaching their religion freely at Peking, and had become in some measure the favourites of the emperor and his ministers, their benevolent feelings towards the missionaries became quite lively. At Tchao-Tcheou the magistrates were assiduous in their attentions to Father Lombard, and those who had been formerly hostile to Father Ricci were, if possible, more friendly than any others. Many families even became converted and received baptism.

"This first glow of enthusiasm, however, cooled after a time, for the populations of these towns, entirely addicted as they were to traffic and material interests, were not very anxious concerning the salvation of their souls, and the things that belonged to eternity. Father Lombard thought it probable that the country people might be better disposed to receive the word of God, and therefore resolved to make an attempt to evangelise the environs of Tchao-Teheou; and he really found these simple rustic men nearer to the kingdom of Heaven than the mandarins, rich merchants, and men of letters of the cities. When he was about to preach in a village, he used to send off, some days before, a zealous neophyte to announce the arrival of a missionary, and prepare the ground for the evangelical seed. The Father then presented himself, and after exhorting the assembled people, gave them a summary explanation of the Decalogue, and the principal articles of the Christian faith. Those who were seriously struck by what they heard, were then asked to write down their names, and an altar was prepared, above which was placed an image of our Saviour, wax lights were kindled, and some prayers chaunted, after which the new catechumens received a catechism from the missionary, and promised to renounce their idols and superstitions. Up to the moment of their baptism, they applied with zeal to the study of doctrine and to the observance of the commandments of God and the precepts of the Church. It was a sort of trial of strength for them, an apprenticeship to the Christian life which they proposed to embrace. A day was then appointed for their baptism, and as much pomp and solemnity as possible given to the ceremony.

"The neophytes were invited from all the country round, and at the conclusion of the festival the newly baptised were escorted home to the accompaniment of music, and with a procession like that which attends a mandarin. These little manifestations pleased the Chinese, who always like a fête and a ceremony; and Catholicism, which is destined to be the religion of the whole human race, is not of a narrow exclusive spirit, but willingly accommodates itself to whatever is harmless and allowable in the peculiar customs of various nations. Religion does not destroy national, any more than individual character; it only improves and sanctifies it.

"The success obtained by Father Lombard among the peasants, reacted upon the towns and quite electrified the citizens. The list of catechumens and neophytes at the mission of Tchao-Teheou rapidly increased, and soon there was witnessed a spectacle hitherto unheard of in China,—namely, that of festivals celebrated sometimes in the town, sometimes in the country, at which rich and poor, learned and ignorant, peasants and mandarins, partook of a repast together and passed the day in sweet and cordial fraternity, because they had been just kneeling together in prayer to Him who is the Father alike of all. Equality can really exist only

among men who can say from the bottom of their hearts, 'Our Father who art in Heaven.'

"The fraternity of feeling thus developed among the Christian neophytes, formed a striking contrast with the cold egotism that withers the souls of most of the Chinese ; and the intimate fusion of various ranks of society was, perhaps, one of the most beneficial effects of the missionaries' preaching. In one of the villages there was a considerable family, all the members of which had embraced Christianity, notwithstanding a very strong opposition on the part of their neighbours, who tried in various ways to frighten them into abandoning their faith, reproached them with having adopted a foreign religion, and never ceased threatening them with the anger of the Chinese Gods. It happened one day that the house of these new Christians caught fire—and the neighbours, instead of going to their assistance, stood looking at the fire and seeming to derive much satisfaction from its progress, regarding it evidently as a punishment of what they called apostacy. In a short time nothing was left of the house but a heap of ruins.

"When, however, the Christians of the environs heard of the disaster, they voluntarily levied a contribution on themselves to rebuild the house of their unfortunate brethren ; they brought the necessary building materials, and laboured with their own hands at the structure, and in a very short time a far more beautiful house than the former one arose, as if by enchantment from the ruins. It was adorned by the voluntary offerings of the neophytes, and provided with furniture and household utensils ; and the pagans could not but see with admiration how the pure flame of Christian charity had repaired the mischief that the material fire had occasioned."—Vol. ii. pp. 162-6.

We must refer the reader to Père Huc's own pages for an account of the conversion of the Imperial Prince Joseph and of three other members of the imperial family, who, on the Feast of the Epiphany, 1605, were baptised under the names of the three Magi-Kings,—Caspar, Melchior and Balthassar, and for the other details of the early progress of the religion in Peking. It will be enough to say that Father Ricci lived to see the mission, according to all human forethought, firmly established.

At his death, which occurred at Peking in 1610, the charge of the Jesuit missions in China devolved upon Father Nicholas Lombard, a native of Sicily, who had already served in China for a period of seventeen years. It was during Father Lombard's tenure of office that the great controversy regarding the lawfulness of the so-called "Chinese ceremonies" arose.

"Father Lombard, though feeling profound respect and admiration for the founder of the mission, did not entirely coincide in the opinions formed by Father Ricci of the religious and philosophical doctrines of China. Father Ricci, after having studied from the very commencement of his apostleship the character and genius of the nation whom he had been called to evangelise, had come to the conclusion that the best means that could be adopted for bringing the Chinese to a knowledge of the truth, would be to subscribe partly to the praises unceasingly lavished upon Confucius by both nation and government, by whom he was regarded as the wise man, *par excellence*, the master of all science, and the legislator of the empire. He thought that in the doctrines advanced by this philosopher as to the nature of God, he found much that bore a considerable resemblance to those of Christianity, and that Tien, or Heaven as conceived by the educated classes, was not the material and visible one, but the true God, the Lord of Heaven, the Supreme Being, invisible and spiritual, of infinite perfection, the creator and preserver of all things, the only God in fact, whom Confucius directs his disciples to adore and worship.

"With regard also to the honours paid by the Chinese to their ancestors, Father Ricci had adopted the same idea, and had looked from the same point of view. He was himself persuaded, and he endeavoured to persuade the other missionaries, that the sacrifices offered to ancestors were purely of a civil nature; that, according to the true meaning of Confucius, they had nothing whatever of a religious or idolatrous signification; and were solely offered in obedience to the feelings of veneration, filial piety and love, by which the Chinese had been, in all ages, inspired towards the authors of their being, and the wise men who had spread the benefits of science and civilization over the empire. Ricci had thus concluded that these sacrifices and national fêtes, if traced to their real sources in the principles of Chinese philosophy, formed no part of a superstitious and pagan worship, but were simply of a civil and political nature, and might be still preserved, at any rate with regard to Confucius, and to their ancestors, by the Christian Chinese.

"Such was the opinion of Father Ricci, and of a large number of his brethren. It was a system that offered every facility to the missionaries, and that greatly assisted them in propagating the Christian faith. The ancient and only religion of the Chinese had always been confined to the worship of Tien (Heaven), of the wise men, and of their ancestors. The delusions of Tao-Sse, and the superstitions of the Bonzes, had captivated them at various periods, but had never obtained any well-rooted belief, and had never been made a part of their faith. By declaring that the worship of Heaven was similar to that of the true God, and that the homage paid to ancestors and to Confucius was a legitimate expression of filial piety towards the chiefs of families and the benefactors of the

race, the missionaries were greatly favoured by the Chinese ideas, instead of coming into collision with them, and never failed to become popular on that account, especially among the educated classes, who willingly abandoned the creed of the Bonzes and of Tao Sse.

"Father Lombard looked at all these Chinese customs from a very different point of view. The esteem that he had felt for the talents and virtue of Father Ricci had induced him before to suspend his judgment, and his scruples as to the correctness of the system followed by this apostle; but when he found himself placed at the head of the mission, and responsible for all the errors that might arise, he considered it his duty to examine this important question with greater attention. He set himself seriously therefore to the study of the works of Confucius, and of his most celebrated commentators, and consulted such of the literary men as could throw a light upon the subject, and in whom he could place confidence. Many other of the Jesuit missionaries entered into the controversy, and opinions were divided. Father Lombard wrote a book on the subject, in which it was examined to the bottom, and in which he came to the conclusion that the doctrine of Confucius and his disciples was tainted with materialism and atheism; that the Chinese in reality recognized no divinity but Heaven, and the general effect that it had upon the beings of the Universe; that the soul in their opinion was nothing but a subtle aeriform substance; and finally, that their views as to its immortality closely resembled the theory of Metempsychosis obtained from Indian philosophers. Regarded from this point of view, the customs of China appeared to Lombard and the missionaries who took his side, as an idolatry utterly incompatible with the sanctity of Christianity,—criminal acts, the impiety of which must be shown to the Chinese, on whom, by the grace of God, the light of the Gospel had shone, and which must be absolutely forbidden to all Christians, whatever might be their condition, or whatever part of the empire they might inhabit. The use of the words, *Tien* and *Chang-Ti*, even, by which they designated the divinity, were interdicted. It will be seen from this how widely the rigorous orthodoxy of Father Lombard differed from the excessive tolerance of Father Ricci.

"Such was the commencement of the disagreements which afterwards proved more fatal to the prosperity of the missions, than the most violent persecutions ever raised by the mandarins. They arose in the bosom of the Society of Jesuits, before missionaries of any other order arrived in China, and we shall, further on, see the dispute developing itself, and assuming the lamentable form of a *fierce contest*. The discussion on Chinese rites, on the worship of ancestors and of Confucius, was not confined within the limits of the Celestial Empire, but spread over Europe, where, as in Asia, the controversy was carried on with the utmost acrimony and passion. Profuse dissertations and numerous pamphlets on the subject were

scattered about everywhere ; but, instead of bringing out the truth, they served but to envelop it in still thicker obscurity, until at last the Church with her sovereign and absolute authority put an end to this long contest, and restored the peace which this time, it must be confessed, had not been broken by the pagans."—Vol. ii. pp. 227-231.

A more fitting opportunity for the examination of this important controversy will arise, on occasion of the publication of Père Huc's concluding volumes ; to which time we must also reserve the later history of these devoted *Fathers of the missions*. *The simple narrative of their fortunes has all the charm of a romance.*

Their successes, however, were not unmixed with many checks and reverses, and especially in the years which immediately followed the Tartar invasion. But this very event, although at first it seemed full of peril to the Christian name, in the end tended still more to establish and extend its influence. The celebrated Father Adam Schall, a native of Cologne, and even more distinguished as a man of science than the founder of the mission, Ricci, obtained in the court of the young emperor, Chun-Tche, a position and an influence far greater than had fallen to the lot of any of his predecessors. He was even raised by an imperial diploma to the rank of the highest aristocracy of the empire : and, in conformity with Chinese usage, similar patents of nobility were also made out for his father and mother. *Père Huc has translated these singular documents, which throw a curious light on the manners and opinions of the Chinese people.*

It is at this point of the history that Père Huc for the present breaks off. He has thus, left undiscussed several most important and interesting questions—the history of the controversy on the Chinese ceremonies in the eighteenth century ; the charges made against the system pursued by the missionaries in the conversion of the natives ; and the origin and progress of the disaffection into which they fell.

We shall look forward anxiously for the concluding volumes of this important work, and we shall reserve till their appearance our own observations on these later and more important stages of the history.

ART. VIII.—*Delusions concerning the Faith and Practice of Catholics.*
By William Dodsworth, M.A. London : Burns and Lambert.

IT is well said by Father Faber, in his newly published work,* that the religious condition of the majority of English Protestants corresponds far more with that of the heathen than with that of the heretic of early Christian times. Little as, we fear, our countrymen will relish the *compliment, a compliment nevertheless it is—at least by comparison.* The Protestant (proper) will find it hard to understand how a state of serious religious disadvantage can be a less real evil than a certain intellectual position; still less how it can be better for a man to have miserably defective notions on a great and most interesting subject, than to have formed his own definite views upon a question which he regards, in virtue of his profession, as strictly within the province of human speculation. But a Catholic, who measures things by another rule, knows how far preferable is that man's state in the sight of God, and how far more hopeful his prospects at the Last Day, who from causes more or less beyond his controul, has never known the Truth, than his, who has proudly exercised his judgment between the one Faith and its thousand-and-one counterfeits, and deliberately chosen one of them in preference to it. English Protestants, then, says Father Faber, are to be treated, as a class, far more like those who go on in a contented and apathetic state of ignorance about the Truth, than like those who have taken up some formal antagonistic ground against it; and this he says, notwithstanding evidence to the contrary, which some persons may find in the intensity of the national prejudice against "Popery." Such prejudice he regards (after Father Newman,) rather as acquiescences in a grand traditional error, than as a form of positive opinion, and thus as nearer to Heathenism, than to Heresy. Average Protestantism, indeed, scarcely reaches the dignity of a heresy; it is far too unintellectual. A heretic, at all events, knows what he holds and what he contravenes. He can give a reason for the faith which is *not* in him; a bad reason, of course, but still a reason of some kind. Our

* "The Creator and the Creature." Richardson and Son, London.
VOL. XLII.—No. LXXXIV. 14

manifold and often not very consistent or consentient opponents, on the contrary, (taken as a body) are pretty much, in the great arena of religious controversy, what the Ephesians were in their deliberations about the doctrine of the apostles. "The assembly was confused, and the greater part knew not for what cause they were come together." Of course we do not forget, as Father Faber observes, that the majority of our countrymen are far better off than heathens in possessing fragments, at least of Divine Truth. But this is only a farther note in their favour, and by consequence an additional plea for mercy.

The consideration which Father Faber thus throws out, is of great importance in all controversial dealings with our brethren of the separation. It throws us upon a mode of treating them which, if it be thus proved to be more suitable to their needs, is undoubtedly far less injurious to the cause of Christian charity. It tends to substitute the controversy of instruction for the controversy of antagonism. Antagonistic controversy is the proper weapon in dealing with heretics; but it is as out of place as it is dangerous, when applied to the case of persons rather ignorant than perverse. A man must be next door to a saint who can combat formal heresy without some sacrifice either of love or of humility. Who can contemplate the case of a deliberate and malignant rejection of the Catholic Faith—nay, who ought to contemplate it?—without some kind of resentment and personal indignation? Yet how hard is it to resent without hatred, and to be indignant without self-complacency! But let us feel ourselves honestly able to look at English Protestantism as a great mis-shapen mass of what Mr. Dodsworth terms "Popular Delusion," and then there is neither pride in attempting to combat it, nor any necessary risk to Christian charity in the actual conflict with it.

Mr. Dodsworth has some remarks on Prejudice at the opening of his tract, which have a far deeper truth than the very unpretending manner in which they are put forth, might lead the casual reader to imagine. They fall in exactly with Father Faber's view of the real position of English Protestants. The great fault, remarks Mr. Dodsworth, with all our popular objectors to the Catholic religion is that, blinded by prejudice, and its attendant apathy about truth, they assume a false premiss, and are deluded by finding that they draw from it a conclusion, correct in

form, but vicious from the pervading fallacy in the *matter of their syllogism*. That treacherous little "minor premiss," which so often proves the stumbling-block of the cleverest minds, because its correct formation depends upon certain moral qualities which mere cleverness cannot guarantee, is at the root of almost every Protestant prejudice of the day. For instance, how many a man, as Mr. Dodsworth observes, is turned away from the Catholic Church by the force of this most (formally) irreproachable syllogism, "Omnis idololatria malum; cultus B. V. M. est idololatria; ergo est malum." Most true, indeed, if the minor premiss be correctly assumed. But that is the point; and there is where PREJUDICE has warped the mind of the reasoner into a wrong direction; and, as Dr. Whately is so prone to remind us in the words of the Greek historian, "Indolent above all things, is the investigation of TRUTH, and men, rather than pursue it, will take up with what comes to hand."

But if this be so, then, as Mr. Dodsworth practically concludes, the best kind of controversy is that which clears up *facts*. Facts it is which are wanted to break in upon the stereotyped self-complacency of that stubborn little minor premiss which will yield to nothing but those facts which are proverbially "stubborn" like itself. Men will not hunt out facts; then let us inflict those facts upon them; and even although they may not be convinced, they will fear to repeat their assertions, or, at any rate, will repeat those false statements with a continually decreasing prospect of gaining the ear of the public. We think it is Father Newman who says that a Protestant falsehood should never be allowed to sink into the public mind without an exposure. The memorable case of the "Edgbaston Mare's-Nest," provides us with an apt illustration. The worthy and really amiable parliamentary champion of the Protestant cause persisted in his pet minor premiss after Dr. Newman's inimitable reply. But the great Oratorian succeeded, not indeed in converting Mr. Spooner, but in turning the laugh of the House of Commons against him, when he declared, to its unspeakable amusement, that after all he must believe the cellars to be cells, and the corkscrews, instruments of monastic discipline.

There is another great advantage in understanding the real point at issue with our Protestant adversaries. The

first duty of a controversialist is to master the true position of his antagonist, not only in order to know how to deal with him, but in order to do him no injustice. As then it helps us against an objector to feel that his logical error is a material and not a formal one, involved in the false or hasty assumption of a premiss, and not in the faulty drawing of the inference; so likewise does it aid our charity towards him to know that, granting his false premiss, his actual conclusion inevitably follows. This Mr. Dodsworth observes, and it is very important. The distinction contains within it a great truth of moral theology, the neglect of which lies at the bottom of many popular mistakes on our own side of controversy. Reverting to our instance; the man who conscientiously believes that the *cultus* of our Lady is idolatrous, is not merely justified in concluding against the Catholic religion, but bound, pending his mistake, to act upon that conclusion. The mistake often made is that of controverting his true conclusion, instead of undeceiving him about his false premiss. See, again, how this same mistake leads to a totally wrong judgment about the relative danger of persons out of Catholic communion. We naturally tend to sympathize more with the indifferentist who embraces all religions in his comprehensive liberality and ours in the number, than with the "bigot," as we call him, who, for the life of him, can take no other view of the Pope than that he is the Anti-Christ of prophecy. Who can wonder at the preference of the first to the second character, so far as human nature is concerned? It is natural to catch at sympathy, and to make much of friendly overtures wherever proffered. In a certain sense it is a good and promising sign where persons, for any reasons, are kind to Catholics, or leave them and their religion alone; and especially since the liberality of the day often contrives to except the Catholic religion from the range of its favour. Moreover, though the term "bigotry" is often abused, such a thing as bigotry in a bad sense there is; prejudice, really wicked and perverse, because uncandid, obstinate, and lie-loving. But, after all allowances and exceptions on both sides, it remains true that a fanatical hatred of our religion is on the whole both better in the sight of God, and more likely to bring a man right in the end than a mere sentimental admiration, or latitudinarian approval, of it, which does but indicate that the religious *idea* is utterly wanting; and

this truth, embodied in theological phrase, Mr. Dodsworth has pressed upon his readers with great force, and in a manner most important to the ends both of truth and charity. (p. 5.)

Father Faber likens the religious state of the great mass of English Protestants to the negative unbelief of the heathen, rather than to the positive perversity of the heretic. Mr. Dodsworth, perhaps with still greater warrant in truth, considers their prejudices as remarkably parallel to those of the Jews at our Lord's coming. And perhaps it would be impossible to direct the Catholic to any model of controversy more perfectly adapted to his object than our Lord's method of dealing with the Jews of His time. They, like Protestants of the present time, were inheritors of certain vain traditions which impeded their reception of the Gospel. They took up strong popular prejudices against places and persons; they would accept no truth which did not square with their own views, or could not be adjusted to their own standard. Our Lord's method was to take them on the ground of such truth as they received; to reason with them out of their own Scriptures; to confront their prejudices with undeniable facts; in short, to give them the right premisses to the true conclusion.

The subjects compendiously noticed in Mr. Dodsworth's little Tract are, 1. The *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin; 2. Transubstantiation; 3. Indulgences; 4. The Holy Scriptures; 5. Catholic Moral Theology; 6. Mortal and Venial sins; 7. Oaths; 8. Infallibility; 9. Formality; 10. The Doctrine of Intention; 11. The Imputation of Unworthy Motives. Under each of these heads Mr. Dodsworth says what will well repay an attentive perusal. We would select his observations upon Moral Theology as peculiarly valuable. Alluding to some papers lately put out in the *Christian Remembrancer*, and which he justly terms "mischievous," Mr. Dodsworth says—

"If it were not before us in black and white it might be thought incredible that a clergyman, of talents and attainments not below the ordinary standard, should imagine that the cases disoussed by Liguori are adduced as a standard for ordinary Catholic teaching. This Protestant Clergyman supposes that a Catholic priest will employ himself in the pulpit in showing how near a man may approach to sin without actually committing it; and again, how far he can go in sin without making it mortal.

"Does this Protestant clergyman need to be told that S. Alponaus

is writing for the use of priests sitting in the tribunal of penance, where it is their duty not to withhold absolution, except in the plainest cases which exclude from it; and, therefore, the very object which S. Alphonsus has in view requires him to take the lowest possible standard, and to draw the most refined distinctions in order to help to a merciful judgment? The priest in the confessional is a judge, more merciful and gentle than secular judges, for he is a representative of the Judge of all; and yet what should we think of the perverseness of that man who would enter into our ordinary courts of judicature and accuse the judge upon the bench of low and impure morals, because he was skilful in pointing out every palliation and extenuating circumstance which would lead to a merciful consideration of the case of the criminal before him? Truly one is compelled to ask if a cold-hearted Pharisaism does not lie at the root of many of the prejudices against our Holy Religion."—pp. 30, 31.

Under the head of "Formality," the author gives the following example of the danger of going by appearances, and making our judgment of external deportment a test of real piety.

"I remember one Good Friday, the first after I became a Catholic, while assisting at the Devotion of the Stations, I was struck with the apparent indifference with which the priest uttered the words of that most touching worship. I felt offended, and thought within myself, 'Surely, if ever, this is an occasion on which such feeling words would be pronounced feelingly. Surely this priest cannot feel what he is uttering?' But how was I reproached when, having gone through half of the Stations, that good priest burst into tears, being no longer able to control the intensity of his feelings. The probability is that what I had thought indifference in his manner arose from the effort to restrain the manifestation of those feelings with which his heart was overflowing."—p. 44.

On this whole subject Mr. Dodsworth very truly says,—

"The only fair way to judge of this question, whether the Catholic religion substitutes forms for things and is satisfied with the outward act, in place of the inward spirit, is to examine its principles and its teachings. Does the mere outward form of things satisfy its requirements? Who that is at all acquainted with its books can imagine such a thing? Where do we find such expression of interior devotion—such *heart-work*, if I may use the expression, as in Catholic books of devotion? Is it not notorious that the most earnest of protestant devotional writers, have been compelled to resort to Catholic books, in proportion as they have required expression for the religion of the heart? Or examine the

devotional part of the Prayer Book of the Establishment, so justly admired in that society, and you will find all the most spiritual and fervent language borrowed from Catholic sources. Is it just or reasonable then for those who use that prayer book, to turn round upon their benefactors, and charge them with pharisaism and formality? But it may be even still more to the point to observe that Catholic books of instruction abound in warnings against formality in religion, that Catholics are expressly taught in their catechism that to pretend to worship God with the lips while the heart is far from Him, is an abomination in His sight; they are taught to make it a special subject of self-examination every day whether they have offended in this matter, and if they have done so to confess it as a sin, and if wilful, obtain absolution from it. This leads me to notice another misapprehension which protestants often entertain."—pp. 45, 46,

Mr. Dodsworth takes occasion from the subject of Prejudice, to animadvert, in terms of well-deserved severity, upon the language of the Protestant Bishop of Oxford in speaking of the Real Presence in the Blessed Eucharist. We must say that the words to which Mr. Dodsworth draws attention are so entirely out of harmony with what we should have expected from Bishop Wilberforce, that we could not have believed in their genuineness, were they not accredited by the name of their "right-reverend" utterer;

"The extent to which prejudice against the Catholic Church may be carried, is illustrated by a recent example. The late lamented Mr. Robert Wilberforce, shortly before he became a Catholic, wrote a book, the main purport of which was to shew that there is a real presence of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, and that Christ is *there* to be adored. Shortly after the publication of the book, the brother of the author, the bishop of Oxford, wrote a letter, inserted in the public newspapers, asserting that there was nothing in Mr. Robert Wilberforce's book, inconsistent with the doctrine of the Church of England. On the fifth of November 1855, the bishop of Oxford preached a sermon before the university, which was afterwards published, in which he accuses Catholics of 'idoltrous impieties,' and of 'worshipping the wafer.' Now Dr. Wilberforce could not be ignorant of the Catholic doctrine, for he had recently read it as expounded in his brother's book. Moreover, he had two brothers in the Catholic Church, of at least equal talents, education, and attainments with himself, and of whom it may certainly be said even setting aside religious considerations, that they are as little capable as himself, of falling into such absurd impieties, and yet he deliberately charges the church, of which they are members,

with the worship of material bread—in other words, with formal idolatry of the most absurd kind. Can we escape from the inference he has allowed prejudice so entirely to blind his eyes, that he has written at random, not knowing what he said?”—p. 7, 8.

Mr. Dodsworth gives the following answer to the objection grounded, upon the supposed formality of Catholic worship:—

“Protestants visiting Catholic countries lounge in to a late Mass on a Sunday morning and to a Benediction in an afternoon. At these services usually no instruction is given, and since they have generally only two services themselves, they perhaps allow themselves to think of these two as *the* Sunday services of the Catholic Church. No doubt, therefore, it seems to them that little is done. But let them become acquainted with what is really the practice of the Church, and they will see how far it exceeds anything that is to be found in the most earnest religious bodies out of it. In this respect let us compare London and its two millions of inhabitants with Rome and its two hundred thousand. In the whole of London, I believe, there is to be found but one small chapel in which communion is administered every day, and I happen to know that some difficulty has been found in obtaining constantly a sufficient number, that is, three persons, without which no celebration can take place according to the rites of the Establishment. Now, in one church alone, the Gesù, at Rome, there are on an average every day, above one hundred communicants. I have heard it stated, on not bad authority to be two hundred, so that my statement is certainly under the mark. And in every church in Rome, in which I have assisted at early Mass there have been always some communicants; in the larger churches generally many, and even in the smallest some.”—p. 41, 42.

In this passage, the average number of communions at the Gesù in Rome is, we think, understated even at 200 a day. Some years ago we had occasion, for a particular purpose, to collect the statistics of various churches on this subject, and we ascertained, on the best authority, that the average of the communions at the Gesù was “as many each day as there are days in the year.” We would submit, however, to Mr. Dodsworth, that he might have instituted his comparison between Catholic and Protestant *London*, as advantageously to his purpose, as between Protestant London, and Catholic Rome. There are churches in London (and what we happen to know of London is doubtless true of our large provincial cities also) in which proportionally to the Catholic population, the number of

communions is as large as in the generality of the Roman churches. The *Gesù* is a very peculiar case, because it is the resort of persons from all parts of Rome, and of Catholic foreigners from all countries. We may add, for the information of Protestant readers, that we never, as a matter of fact, happened to be present at an early Low Mass in London (except under some very peculiar circumstances) at which there were not persons for communion. However, we have no desire to lay too much stress upon religious statistics, which have always something unsatisfactory about them.

Thus is it that Mr. Dodsworth would meet anti-Catholic prejudices with the authorized reply "Come and see." There can be no doubt that the more the Church is known, the better will she be understood, and the more surely loved. Yet every day brings home to us, as Catholics, how hard it is to communicate our experience with those outside. Controversy even at best, is little more than a game at cross-purposes. As to arguments, they scarcely appear to advance matters towards a conclusion, still less to conclude them. Facts, as we have already said, are the only really telling things, and doubtless they do their work in the long run. Yet even facts are weapons which will sometimes rebound from the shield of prejudice. Even facts require to be read by the light of Faith, which, though we are permitted to have a share in helping towards it, is, in the last resort, not ours to command. Again, we must not forget that the phenomena of the Catholic Church, after every explanation which can be given of them, must remain a mystery to those without her pale. They alone, who are of God, can discern all the things of God. Moreover, there may be facts connected with our public manifestation, not only difficult of interpretation, but really to our disadvantage. We not only fall miserably short of our ideal, but often, from the perversity of our evil wills contradict it. Do what we will, we cannot make even facts square with our theories of perfection, far less with the demands of our rigorous adversaries. And it is our wisdom to acknowledge that so, alas, it is.

Yet, after all, there is ample room, and great occasion, for such defences as Mr. Dodsworth's, so truthful, so temperate, so forbearing, so loving. Especially is it impossible that such efforts can be thrown away where enforced and illustrated by Example. What would have

availed all the Apologies of the early Church without the Martyrdoms? And who shall say that many a conversion of our own day has not been a real martyrdom in the aggregate of the most bitter though hidden sacrifices it has involved? And when we come into the province of personal sacrifice, we are in the midst of a new and higher kind of spiritual armoury than that of mere reasoning; more bright, more keen, more effectual. The sharp, albeit bloodless struggles through which many a convert has reached, or kept, the Faith, will have gone to plead, better than words, with a God of infinite compassion, for souls which have been deaf to all appeals, or have wrestled with overwhelming convictions, till God, in His own good time, has sealed them for Himself.

ART. IX.—*L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au IV. Siecle*, par M. Albert de Broglie, Première Partie. Règne de Constantin. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris Didier et Cie. 1856.

ON the first appearance of the Prince de Broglie's book we took occasion to allude to it briefly, as one among many recent publications bearing upon what is pre-eminently the question of our age—the relations of the early Church with the State. The singular merit of M. de Broglie's work, however; its great learning; the rare beauty and eloquence of its style; the sincere and hearty religious spirit—the unflinching appreciation of all the institutions and all the principles of Catholicism, tempered and subdued by consideration for the views of those who are yet insensible to such sympathies, which it exhibits; all appear to call for a more detailed and careful examination. The book itself, indeed, is too important and too interesting to be dismissed, in a journal like ours, with a few brief and casual observations; and the personal merits of its distinguished author, his well-known zeal for religion, his remarkable learning, and the self-denying perseverance with which, amid the distractions and engagements of his high position, he has hoarded his scanty snatches of leisure for studies too

rarely cultivated by his order; and has enriched the Catholic literature of France with fruits, at once racy and mature, which might do honour to the laborious leisure of one of the veteran recluses of learning;—all these constitute an additional claim upon our attention, which it would be worse than ungrateful to disregard.

We have already explained that the “*Reign of Constantine*” is but a portion of a vast and comprehensive work which M. de Broglie has projected on the relations of the Church with the Roman Empire. But it is in many respects the most interesting, if it be not the most important portion of that grand subject. It is precisely in this period, indeed, that we must seek the first series of data for the solution of one of the great problems of the history of Christianity, its conflict with the paganism of the Roman world. This mighty conflict, it is true, had begun long before, and its latter history stretches far down into the after ages. But not only is the career of Constantine its culminating point; but it may be truly said that in the history of Constantine, for the first time, the conflicting principles meet each other face to face and in open day. Till then there had been little between them that could properly be called conflict. The collision till then was that of the master with the slave; the relation was that of the executioner to his victim.

And hence it is from this period that the so-called philosophical historians of the Christian Religion commonly profess to begin. If they deal with the times which preceded this, it is only in the way of retrospective summary; and all their speculations as to the subsequent history stretch back to this as a starting-point. It was as Gibbon “sat musing amidst the ruins of the capitol, while the barefooted friars were singing vespers in the temple of Jupiter,” that the idea of writing the *Decline and Fall* of the city first started to his mind.* It is impossible to read a chapter of his history of Constantine without feeling that he had made that Emperor the great centre of his drama. And the latest English historian of Christianity, Dean Milman, although he had commenced with a general history of the Church in the Roman empire, and had devoted his first volumes to the ante-Constantinian period, saw so strongly,

* Gibbon's *Miscellaneous Works*, i. p. 129.

nevertheless, the line of demarcation which at that period had impressed itself upon the map of the fortunes of the human race, that he has thrown the subsequent history into another and independent form, and deals with Christianity, from that period forth, as a new and distinct (or at least newly modified) intellectual phenomenon—new in its principles, new in its system, new in its organization, new in its spirit;—the creation, in a word, of impulses, feelings and habits of thought to which it theretofore had been a stranger.

It is plain, indeed, that no one who looks below the mere surface of events, can turn his thoughts for a moment to this momentous period without being struck by the extent and the importance of the revolution which it involves. Upon it are concentrated all the scattered interests of the three preceding centuries. Vast and various as the ramifications of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire had already become, it is nevertheless true to say, that, at the date of the birth of Constantine, the entire civilization of the Roman world was pagan to its very core. The laws of the Roman Empire had not only grown up outside of all Christian influences, but were even founded primarily in that religious system against which Christianity had come to do battle. Every social usage of Rome, every civil ordinance, every political institution, had its origin in Rome's idolatrous religion, or at least was modified by its spirit. All the arts, all the science, all the letters of Rome were pagan. From the cradle of the Roman citizen to his funeral pile, the religion of Rome never loosed its hold upon him. And although in the universal scepticism which prevailed, much of this influence was unacknowledged, nevertheless it often affected indirectly, and in many instances insensibly, even those to whom it was a subject of ridicule and disdain.

It was with this gigantic system, still powerful, though corrupted to its very core, that the rising Church had to deal. When Constantine became the Christian head of this mighty pagan empire, and placed himself, though not yet with complete unreserve, in the hands of the Church for the great design of its Christianization, the main problem of his government was to effect this great object with the least amount of danger and of offence;—to consider how far it was possible to reform rather than to revolutionize; how much of what had so long been profaned by corrupt

use, might be purified and utilized by Christian influence or Christian destination; and how far it was possible to bring both the hostile elements into harmony, without unnecessarily outraging or irrevocably alienating either.

To the Church, it is true, an hour of triumph was come. The cruel enemy under whose oppression she had so long lain writhing, was now at her feet. Of that whole vast system which had hitherto been used only for her persecution and enslavement, and which was now in some sense submitted to her for judgment, there was hardly a single detail which had not been employed as an instrument against her, and which had not, therefore, amply merited condemnation at her hands. "If the Church," says the Prince de Broglie, "had thought fit, on the very morrow of her triumph, to declare war against the whole social system of Rome; if she had razed its monuments to the ground, broken its images into fragments, burnt its libraries, and abolished or reversed its laws, she would only have done an act of just retaliation." But, on the contrary, one of the most pleasing studies in the history of the fourth century, is to trace out the mild and maternal policy which she adopted instead. With that divine instinct which guides all her external dealings with the world, she carefully sought out among the dark corruptions and enormities which deformed the existing scheme of society, all that was free, or could be rendered free, from the prevailing taint. The good she unhesitatingly adopted; the indifferent she consecrated by an ennobling and sanctifying destination;—even the bad, when it was not possible summarily to reject it, she mitigated and counteracted. Avoiding in all things a destructive revolution, she adopted, as far as possible, the external state of things which she found established;—correcting and purifying by her own peculiar enactments, reforming almost insensibly by the influence which she infused, and as it were impressing the saving sign of the cross even upon the monuments of paganism itself.

This is the story which the philosophical Christian historian reads in the annals of the fourth century. But, in order to comprehend this story, it is necessary to go below the external surface of events. The historian of declining paganism, Zosimus, contemplates it with far other eyes; and among the countless writers of the many different varieties of shades of opinion which lie between these extremes, each

will form a different estimate, not only of the course of events, but still more of their motives, their tendencies, and the impulses from which they arose. It is hardly necessary to say that history has long ceased to be a mere chronicle of names and dates, if indeed it ever was truly such. It is no longer possible to obtain a perfectly neutral record of events, uncoloured by the personal opinions of the author. Perhaps, indeed such a record as this is little to be desired. Indifference to the moral sense too often accompanies or follows the coldness of intellectual eclecticism; and the historian who should thus be able, as it were, to divest himself of his own subjectivity, would be very likely to lay aside at the same time that earnestness of character, and honest energy of thought, which are the surest foundations of the love of truth for its own sake.

On the contrary, almost every modern writer who professes to treat the subject of general history, whether sacred or profane, has written less as an individual, than as a follower of one or other of the great historical schools.

Some follow what may be described as the Necessitarian or Fatalist school, and look upon history simply as a register of the action of certain general and irresistible laws, which, in the recurrence of the same circumstances and conditions, produce their effect as infallibly as the laws which regulate the physical world. For them history contains no moral lesson. It is but a curious and exciting spectacle;—interesting as an intellectual or æsthetical study—as a suggestive collection of data for philosophical speculation; and even amusing as an exhibition of the various action of individual peculiarities under the common influences to which all alike are subject. But for them its interest is entirely destitute of moral character. It involves no moral teaching. It implies no moral responsibility. It is simply a department—the brightest department it is true, but still, a mere department—of the general science of Natural History. Such, with hardly an exception, were the materialist philosophers of the eighteenth century, Voltaire, Volney, Raynal, and their fellows. Such, too, although presented in a less coarse and revolting form, and disguised under more subtle and more elevating theories, are the principles of the great enemies of the French materialists—the metaphysical historians of the German school in the early part of this century.

There is another school which may be called the Naturalist, or Humanitarian; whose followers, while they freely recognize the moral teachings of history, take no higher range for their speculation than the mere natural destinies, as well as the natural powers and impulses, of man;—who either refuse to recognize the hand of Providence in history at all, or at the most regard it but as imparting the first impulse to human progress—as impressing upon the primeval human mind the faculty of perfectibility as well as the tendency to development, and then leaving it to work out the great problem of its destiny by the exercise of its own powers and the guidance of its own impulses. To the historians of this school history is simply the journal of human progress,—the record of its struggles and its aspirations, of its triumphs and its failures, its backslidings and its success. But these struggles, these failures, these successes, are strictly its own. Human Nature is the exclusive subject of their narrative. Man is their only hero.

And, strange as it may seem, among the followers of this school are to be found many who distinctly recognize the supernatural destinies of the human family, and the supernatural gifts with which it is endowed for their realization,—many even of the historians of the Christian Church. Nor do we mean merely those writers, Christians only in name, to whom Christianity is but one of the stages of man's spiritual and intellectual progress—far higher in degree and more precious in intellectual gifts, but yet hardly differing in kind from the other great and vital truths embodied in the various schemes of religion, some more, some less perfect, by which, at different periods and in different circumstances, men have been helped forward in their march of civilization. We mean that far larger and more popular class of historians, in whose eyes, though they fully and freely recognize its divine character and divine revelation, Christianity nevertheless is in a great degree a matter of race and of country; shaped and modified, both as to its tenets and as to its practices, by the social, intellectual, and national peculiarities of the various peoples who have embraced it; one system for the Jew, another for the Gentile; one for the Greek, one for the Roman; one for the dreamy visionary of the East, another for the fierce and impulsive barbarian of the north; one in a monarchy, another in a republic;

one in an age of letters, another in a period of war; one for the subtle and sensuous imagination of Italy; another for the practical brain of the hardy and energetic Teuton. The reader will not require to be reminded of examples of this class. The entire Rationalistic school of Germany, — Henke, Gieseler, not to speak of Baur and his followers, — are familiar to every one who has given the least attention to these studies; and the most learned and popular of modern English Church historians, Dean Milman, has adopted this as his leading principle in the treatment of the history from the dates of the disruption of the Roman empire.

Another great division of historians comprises what may be called the Providential School; who not only recognize the supernatural gifts and supernatural destinies of man in history, but regard history mainly as the exponent of the dealings of God's ever-present Providence in guiding and controlling the fortunes of the human race.

In this school, of course, there are many shades of opinion. It is not merely that the writers look different ways for the repository or exponent of this providential interposition; — that Catholic historians, from Baronius to Rohrbacher, find it in the Church, in the Popes, and in holy men providentially raised from time to time in special emergencies; while Protestants, like Ullmann, Flathe, or D'Aubigné, discover it in the long series of protests against papal authority which they trace from the days of Sylvester down to those of Leo X.; from Jovinian, and Vigilantius, down through Fra Dolcino, Segarelli, or Peter Waldo, to Wycliffe, Hus, and Martin Luther himself. The varieties in this school to which we allude are drawn rather from the different degrees in which they recognize the direct and immediate interposition of Providence.

It is in this, as in the different schools of biblical exegesis regarding the nature of inspiration; which some extend even to the sentences and words employed by the divine writers, while others explain it down into a mere general immunity from substantial error. In like manner with some, (and these most deeply reverent historians,) God's Providence in history might also seem to be little more than mere knowledge or advertence.

On the other hand it is equally possible to fall into the opposite extreme, and to represent this Providence as amounting to continual and immediate interposition, and

even to such individual and personal guidance and direction, as to overrule and destroy human liberty itself.

Another still more important difference among historians of this school relates to the nature of the providential interposition which they recognize. Catholic historians, it need hardly be said, reverently regard as one of the established though extraordinary mediums through which God acts upon the human mind, supernatural interpositions and miraculous exhibitions of super-human power or of super-human faculties of mind. Nor is this entirely denied even by non-Catholic historians, especially for the earlier ages, and when the Gospel is preached for the first time among unbelieving nations. But if they be regarded as a permanent characteristic of the Christian community, these miraculous gifts are commonly denied by Protestant historians, not only to individuals but to the Church.

Indeed, the whole theory of what have been called "ecclesiastical miracles," meets but little favour outside of Catholic literature. On the contrary, the prevailing tendency of most modern historians is to reduce within the narrowest possible limits all action of Divine Providence upon man, other than that which is purely natural—that which is imparted through those ordinary faculties, dispositions, and gifts, whether of the intellect or of the will, with which men have been endowed by the Creator.

A familiar example of the opposite views which may thus be taken by different writers of the same event, or series of events, is the question of the marvellous rapidity and success with which the Christian religion was diffused throughout the Roman Empire,—a success which one class of historians regards as so extraordinary and so completely beyond and above all human influences, as in itself, and by its miraculous and superhuman character, to form an argument of the divine origin of Christianity; while another contends that it was but the result of a combination of natural influences, each assisting the rest, and all developed and perfected by the moral excellence and intellectual sublimity of the Christian scheme of doctrine and of morals. And the same diversity of view, of course, extends to many of the particular incidents of the Christian history, not only as regards their miraculous character, but also as regards the credibility of the authorities on which they rest.

Hence as there is no period in the history of the world in which this conflict of opinion is more animated, than that which the Prince de Broglie has chosen for his subject, it is with no common pleasure that we welcome his *Regne de Constantin*, as a valuable contribution to our Catholic historical literature. It is a work professedly addressed to modern tastes, and intended to grapple with modern views, and to encounter modern fallacies and modern prejudices. For with all its various and profound erudition, it is essentially a popular book;—popular in the same sense as the higher popular philosophy and history which form pre-eminently the study of our age. The narrative is always clear, vigorous, and connected. There are many of the descriptions which, for force and vividness, may bear comparison with the most brilliant pictures in the whole range of the well-known “pictorial school” of France. The dissertations appended to the work, and the critical observations interspersed in the text, display no ordinary ability and research. Every doubtful or disputed fact is carefully discussed; every important authority is fully and impartially sifted. Nor does M. de Broglie confine himself in these to the older critics and historians. He is as much at home among the writers of the present day, Neander, Bunsen, Dorner, Gieseler, Hefele, Döllinger, as among the great classics, Catholic and Protestant, of the seventeenth and eighteenth century. His judgment, too, of characters and motives are marked by singular calmness and moderation; and his general views of the history, the moral, doctrinal, or philosophical opinions which they embody, uniformly exhibit elevation of tone, depth and originality of thought, and an enlightened spirit of Christian criticism which, while it accepts the conclusions of faith with unhesitating confidence, and yields to the sentence of authority with unwavering submission, nevertheless is not on this account a whit less fearless (or rather, perhaps, is on this very account the more fearless) in asserting its own freedom in all that fairly falls under the judgment of historical science.

Indeed, the Prince de Broglie's book may be described as peculiarly the creation of the tastes, perhaps also of the requirements, of modern literature in France. While the author never for a moment hesitates as to his own convictions, or shrinks from their avowal, he at the same time never loses sight of the fact that there are thousands

among the educated classes of his countrymen who are still strangers to the very alphabet of these convictions, and on whose minds they would fall, if presented in their fulness and without preparation, not only without influence, but even with a pernicious influence. Accordingly, writing not alone for believing Catholics, but for cold and sceptical thinkers besides, he has felt it necessary not to overlook the doubts and difficulties which it is impossible to ignore. And thus he has often, if we may so speak, been forced to lower the tone of his history, in order that its language may be intelligible to those to whom it is addressed ;—although never at the sacrifice of any, even of the secondary principles of true Catholic criticism, much less of Catholic belief.

We have thought it a duty to enter into these particulars, because we are aware that it has been inferred from a phrase which occurred in our former passing notice of the Prince de Broglie's book, that we adopted as our own certain exceptions which have been taken against the tone of some portions of his history, and especially of the historical retrospect which he has prefixed to his narrative of the Reign of Constantine. The writer of the strictures to which we allude,* the venerated abbot of the Benedictine Abbey of Solesmes, Dom Gueranger, is justly entitled to our most profound respect ; and every opinion of his carries with it, to our mind, all the authority which rare learning, profound knowledge of antiquity, and eminent services to literature—eminent even in the illustrious Order to which he belongs—must ever command. But although there are some of Dom Gueranger's objections to the statements or opinions put forward in M. de Broglie's book in which, as it will be seen, we fully coincide, we cannot help differing widely from his view of M. de Broglie's general line of argument ; and we believe many of the particular criticisms by which he supports this view, to be much overstrained and founded on complete misconception.†

Nevertheless, it is no part of our present purpose, to

* A series of articles which have appeared at intervals in the *Univers*, from October 19, 1856, to the present time.

† We refer particularly to the articles which appeared in the *Univers* of Oct. 19, Nov. 16, and March 8.

enter into any discussion of the justice of these criticisms. The truth is, that Dom Gueranger and the Prince de Broglie may be taken as representatives of two independent schools which have ever existed in the Church—schools whose opposite principles we can trace as far back as the days of Tertullian on the one side, and Clement of Alexandria upon the other. Each of these schools, now as then, renders the reason of what are the common convictions of both upon grounds entirely distinct from those which approve themselves to the mind of the other; and in the wise design of the great Disposer of men's hearts, both of them find now, as they did then, a class of hearers for whom their teaching is peculiarly adapted. The philosophers who would have turned with ridicule from Tertullian's "*Credo quia impossibile*," thronged in eager and wondering groups to the halls where Clement was inaugurating the union of Philosophy and Faith. Nor do we doubt that, in the various and conflicting habits of men's minds, there are hundreds in our own day who would listen with indifference and disregard to the high-toned appeal of Dom Gueranger, or perhaps close their ears in scorn against it, and yet will receive with favour, and meditate with fruit, the less lofty but more persuasive reasonings of the noble author of the *Regne de Constantin*.

This is a point, however, on which the Prince de Broglie will be the best exponent of his own views. The leading principle upon which his views are founded is, that we are not to be restrained by any mistaken feeling of reverence for the mysterious and super-human character of the evidences of religion, "from studying calmly in the first origin of the Church the secret of the resources by which the miracle of her development and her triumph were prepared. "Christian writers," he continues, "prostrating themselves in a laudable spirit of adoration, have too often seemed to think that the divinity of Christ's work, and even of His Person, would be misunderstood, unless every detail in the establishment of the Church were proved to be equally mysterious, super-human, and inexplicable. In following the progress of faith, they insist, and not without reason, on the constant disproportion between the means employed and the results obtained. They love to contemplate the giant of paganism struck to the earth by the shepherd's sling. The less they

comprehend, the more they admire; the less they can attribute to man, the more they refer to God. They take a pleasure in the wonder which they feel, and their respect would be diminished, were not their understanding confounded. We do not dispute either the touching beauty or the partial justice of this view;—a view which has supplied the defenders of Christianity with the matter of some of their most eloquent demonstrations. Nevertheless we *should be sorry to rely exclusively upon it*. This would be to neglect one of the principal, and not the least divine, of the characters of the Christian religion—its accordance with the laws of history and the conditions of human nature. Christianity has not been an unexpected accident in the destiny of humanity. On the contrary, it rises up as a culminating point in the series of ages. Every thing that goes before leads towards it, everything that comes after flows from it. Hence it is neither an offence against Christianity nor a denunciation of its divine authority, to seek out and place in full light all the causes which have prepared its way and facilitated its progress. If the hand of its Founder is that which has disposed the course of events from all eternity, that hand must have disposed them so as to act as auxiliaries to its course. If the truth which Christianity has revealed, is a ray of that universal truth which reposes in God's bosom, it could not but have recognized as its own, and absorbed into itself all the imperfect truths, the besoiled tatters of which the systems of philosophy disputed with each other. If Christianity came to assuage the thirst of souls, the nations, those wandering flocks of souls, could not fail to leap with joy and throw themselves greedily upon it at its approach. In this way morals, philosophy, the political and moral condition of society in the ancient world;—all must have then served to second its progress, and all must now serve to facilitate their comprehension.”*

Hence it is plain that, in the line of argument which he has followed, M. de Broglie's sole object is to press into the service of the Christian evidences, a historical demonstration which had hitherto been chiefly used by the adversaries of Christianity as an argument against its divine or super-human character. The success of his reasoning

* *Regne de Constantin*, i. pp. 66-7.

serves to illustrate by a new example the principle which Cardinal Wiseman has eloquently explained in his opening Lecture on the Connexion of Science and Revealed Religion ; to show that it is with history, as it has been with astronomy, geology, ethnography, physiology, and every other branch of human learning ; and that although in the infancy of that science, such as it has become in the hands of its modern cultivators, (as in that of its sister studies,) the results to which it seemed at first to point have worn an aspect apparently unfavourable to religion, yet, from the moment when its true principles have been explained, and its real data have been fully ascertained and systematized, what at first had seemed to be an evidence against religion, is found to be a new argument of its eternal and unchanging consistency and truth.

Indeed, those who have regarded the view of the inquiry into the progress of Christianity thus eloquently explained by the Prince de Broglie, as a compromise of the divine and miraculous character of that great event, have overlooked the fact that M. de Broglie over and over again declares it to have been a miracle ; that he considers this view of it but as one out of many topics which combine to produce the complete demonstration of its divinity ; and that, far from discarding the other arguments, he fully admits and insists upon their force, and only desires, that, in consideration of the variety of minds to each of which it is necessary to appeal by reasoning suited to its habit of thought, or its capacity, the argument should not be enforced exclusively from the miraculous and super-human point of view.

"Even in the internal organization of the Church," he continues, "it is permitted us to admire the wisdom and depth of combination ; the union of an invincible power of resistance and an elastic power of expansion ; a mixture of authority and independence, of election and of hierarchy, which realizes and surpasses the most perfect political constitutions. For the Church is a society of men which God Himself has organized ; nor is it therefore to be wondered, that He has made it the most solid and the best balanced of all human societies. The touch of the workman is recognized in the perfect sound of the instrument, and the unknown harmony which He can draw therefrom. Thus in the history of Christianity it is often from the very perfection of the human work that the divine intervention

makes itself known ; a new species of prodigy which opens a vast perspective to the reflection of the historian, and which is in perfect conformity with the spirit of a religion whose Founder, one in a twofold nature, was at once the Supreme God and the Ideal Man.”*

Hence M. de Broglie dwells but slightly upon the topics ordinarily urged by the apologists, although no one could more strongly insist upon their force. He applies himself chiefly in his introduction to the examination of two points; topics, indeed, naturally suggested by the very subject of his work; first how far the progress of Christianity was assisted by what might appear at first sight to be its deadliest and most formidable adversary—the vast extent and the marvellously perfect organization of the Roman Empire; secondly, how much it may be said to have owed to that universal desolation of religious truth which it found throughout this vast Empire—to the deep and painful void which the worn-out paganism of Rome had left behind; and to that instructive craving after truth in doctrine and in morals which paganism could neither extinguish nor satisfy, and to which the saving and consoling tenets of the Gospel, however revolting to the desires of sense, and humiliating to the pride of intellect, came as a message of hope, of peace, and of consolation.

To the illustration of these topics, M. de Broglie has applied all the stores of his very remarkable erudition, profane and sacred. In two sketches, the first “on the Unity of the Empire,” the second “on the Unity of the Church,” he has addressed himself to the two points just alluded to. In the first, his clear and masterly survey of the extent, the resources, and the organization of the Empire, leaves little to be desired, and in some points may be read with profit, even after Gibbon’s celebrated chapter on the same subject: and the brief but comprehensive summary of the history of the Empire, from Augustus to Diocletian, which is interspersed, exhibits these resources in their bearing upon the progress of the Church. The historical survey of the condition of the young Christian community, which is equally interesting, and traces it down from the apostolic age, through the several stages of its conflict with the declining paganism of Rome;—

* I. pp. 67-8.

through the age of the Gnostic heresies ; through the age of philosophical speculation ; and lastly through the fierce struggle of physical force by which, at least as regards their external relations, the contest was practically brought to a close. A third section, in many respects more generally interesting than either of the others, is devoted to the relations which subsisted between Christian and Pagan society during those ages of conflict.

It would be impossible to do justice by any analysis either to the views or to the reasoning of this Introduction. We shall only venture upon one extract which may be taken as a characteristic one ;—the contrast of Tertullian, and Origen, and of the opposite lines of thought of which these remarkable men are severally the representatives, although both in an extreme and exaggerated degree. After explaining, in common with all the historians of patristic literature, the diversity of spirit and tone which, from the time of Clement of Alexandria, is observable in the writers of the Greek and of the Latin Churches, but which, nevertheless, however tending of themselves to conflict, are maintained in salutary equilibrium under the yoke of the same authority, M. de Broglie proceeds :

“ If we desire to see in its extreme consequences the difference of the two Churches, it is only necessary to study the two great contemporaries of this third age, Tertullian and Origen. The one possesses the spirit of the Latin, the other of the Greek Church ; but both to an exaggerated extreme. The one can only feel horror and disdain for every human science ; the other exhibits for the efforts, and even for the errors, of humanity a patient, and even at times an excessive condescension. Tertullian, converted late in life, after having lived amidst the corruption of Rome and of Carthage, every where struck by the odious spectacle presented by paganism, only studies pagan society in its bloody amphitheatres, its impure and effeminate orgies, the obscene and absurd ceremonies of its temples. All that comes from it is foul in his eyes ; he never speaks of it but with the unrelenting asperity of an indignant penitent. Origen, on the contrary, born of a pious family, sheltered against the storms of the world under the wings of Christian masters, had lived securely from childhood in intercourse with the charming spirits of Greece and of the wisdom of ancient Egypt. In every work of man Tertullian can only perceive the influence of the demon who had destroyed him ; Origen, on the contrary, is always on the search for the trace of the divine hand which created him. This difference is observable throughout ; in the contests with pagans and with heretics ; in the expositions of doctrine ; in the

commentaries on Scripture ; in the general tenor of the writings ; and finally, in the very errors themselves. Tertullian, while addressing his *Apology* to the Roman magistrate and the Nations, hardly restrains himself from insulting those whom he wishes to convince and to propitiate ; Origen, in the eight books of his discussion with Celsus, follows step by step the argumentation of the pagan philosopher, refuting him with moderation and patience, relying, especially throughout one entire book, on the conformity of Christianity and Judaism with the general order of the world !"—Vol. I. pp. 122-4.

After having described the severe asceticism of Tertullian, and the rigour of his principles in all that regards even the slightest compromise of faith, he pursues the contrast into another field.

"Origen did not yield to him either for purity of morals or courage in persecution. From his eighteenth year he fasted ; he walked barefoot ; he slept on the hard earth. He went to visit the martyrs ; accompanied them before the judge ; and embraced, says Eusebius, even those of them whom he did not know, at the very place of punishment. But this forgetfulness of self, which in Tertullian had its source in a gloomy asceticism, in Origen flowed from the abundance of his charity. 'Nothing,' says his scholar, St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, 'could equal the sweetness of his discourses. The charms of his charity took the hearts of his hearers by violence. A portion of this holy violence of love has passed into his writings. It is no longer the passion of the African orator ; it is the attraction of a rich imagination, developed by study and enkindled by the furnace which burns within. All the natural faculties subsist in this soul, sanctified, it is true, but yet, with all its avenues still open to sympathy ; and we can easily comprehend the excessive scruple which impelled this loving man to suppress violently in himself, along with the fires of youth, the too dangerous and too facile communication of human feelings. Even in his doctrine itself, this love of his fellow-man, which constituted the charm of his teaching, was not without its danger. The subtlety of his spirit, the taste for allegorical interpretations, which arose from his desire of making the Scriptures attractive for pagan imaginations, led him more than once unconsciously to trench upon the precision of dogma. The simplicity of the biblical narratives was corrupted by the symbolical sense which he delighted to discern therein. He tried to explain the mysteries by metaphysical developments, which were often borrowed from recollections of Plato, and which sometimes deformed instead of illustrating them.'—pp. 124-6.

True, nevertheless, to the one great idea which he proposes to himself, M. de Broglie is careful to explain

how these natural tendencies and impulses were overruled, and still more their influence upon the public faith controlled, by that central authority, which, in his eyes, is the foundation of the Christian system.

"Such, in the course of their natural predispositions, were the tendencies of the career of these two great minds—the representatives of the two different currents of thought which pervaded the Church of the third century; nor could they have failed to have drawn away, each in its own course, the numerous audiences which hung upon their words, had eloquence and genius alone given the law to the Christian Church. But an authority stronger and more constant than individual inspiration interposed in turn to control them; and, when it was no longer able to restrain them, did not hesitate to cut them off from its fold. Tertullian and Origen, although the first men, in point of genius in the full sense of the word, whom Christianity had yet produced, were neither bishops nor saints; and it is even doubtful whether both did not end by being heretics. On the day on which they threatened to impress on one or other of the Churches an eccentric movement, which might have led to separation, the excessive rigour of Tertullian, and the wild imaginations of Origen, found in the authority of the Church, first a counterpoise and then a condemnation. In intolerance, and sometimes even in extreme humility, there is a secret pride which takes delight in anathemas. This sentiment was the ruin of Tertullian. He ended by finding the Church too mild, too patient, too accessible to trial and to repentance. He sought a refuge in the sect of Montanus—a sort of Christian stoicism which exaggerated the severities of the Gospel, while it mistook its inexhaustible mercy. There he was able to give himself up at his ease to the gloomy inspirations of his genius; to refuse penance to sins of all degrees of grievousness; to multiply fasts; to preach celibacy; and to excommunicate second marriages. Irritated at not being able to procure for these rigours the sympathy of the powerful authority of the Church, he finished by rising up openly against her, and by insulting in his chair the Bishop of Rome, the Sovereign Pontiff, 'the Prince of Bishops,' (as he himself calls him,) who had thought it right to condemn him. His impatience of the yoke became such, that it was only satisfied when he had founded a new sect of his own, of which he died the heresiarch.

"Less violent in the expression, more difficult to seize and to determine, but perhaps more to be feared for their attractiveness and their profundity, the errors of Origen were not less rigorously watched. It was especially on the subject of the mysterious nature of the Personality of Christ that his over-bold philosophical speculations excited, both during his life and after his death, the jealous but legitimate susceptibility of the Church. In reality, however, he was less dangerous by his own writings, which were always

animated by a spirit so pure, than by the impulse which he communicate to spirits whom he did not possess the power to restrain. Upon his footsteps, in the same path of over-free discussion and interpretation, followed the ill-regulated spirits, Sabellius, and Paul of Samosata, the predecessor and parent of Arius. From this day forward, Alexandria never ceased to be agitated by dangerous questions of religious metaphysics, and by discussions in which the faith of one of her most pious bishops, St. Dionysius, appeared for a moment to totter. Becoming involved in suspicion through the evil fame of this posterity, by turns invoked, compromised, assailed, defended, the memory of Origen has become one of the problems of the annals of the Church. His glory remains as a brilliant but uncertain light, which has never been able to disengage itself altogether from the clouds which hang around it."—Vol. I. pp. 126 8,

M. de Broglie's historical Introduction brings the narrative as far down as the memorable edict of toleration which was wrung from the cruel Galerius by the horrible plague with which he had been smitten. The main history itself, after a brief sketch of the birth and early years of Constantine, commences with his escape from the honourable surveillance in which he was detained at Nicomedia, and his succession, by the choice of the army, to his father Constantine Chlorus. The Prince's narrative of these events is extremely careful and well-considered. He has distinguished accurately the several steps in the last persecution which is commonly called that of Diocletian, though in truth the infamy of it belongs of much better right to Galerius. His account of the final conflict with Maxentius too is exceedingly interesting; although he appears to hesitate about Eusebius's narrative of Constantine's celebrated Vision of the Cross, and, in our opinion, has not given their full weight to the arguments in favour of its reality and miraculous character. His hesitation clearly arises, not from any difficulty as to such miraculous interpositions, but from doubt as to the sufficiency of the evidence, and from its apparently conflicting character: but he has overlooked altogether the *a priori* considerations drawn from the intrinsic probabilities of the circumstances themselves; nor has he attached sufficient weight to the prevalence of the belief of some supernatural appearance even among the pagans;—a belief attested by the Panegyric Oration delivered at Rome immediately after the victory; by the inscription set up by

the senate ; and describing his success obtained *instinctu divinitatis*; and by the oration of the Pagan Nazarius in 321; all of which, however vague, are strikingly confirmed and determined to this particular sign, by the statue which Constantine himself erected, and which represents him as holding in his hand a spear surmounted by a cross, with an inscription to the effect that "*by that saving sign* he had delivered the city from a tyrant." Taken altogether, the effect of these considerations has always appeared to us irresistible ; and we must confess that while we cordially agree with M. de Broglie (Vol. I. p. 218) that the difficulties against it are so grave that good faith makes it a duty to avow and to grapple with them ; we must protest even against the hypothetical recognition of their force under which he appears disposed to take refuge. The difficulties against the reality of the apparition are, in our mind, not only intrinsically susceptible of a satisfactory solution, but are far more than counterbalanced by the positive arguments in its favour.

From the date of the Victory of the Pons Milvius, the fortunes of Constantine are inseparably connected with those of the Christian Church. On the strange and inexplicable questions connected with his personal belief at this period and the years immediately succeeding, which have so long perplexed historians, M. de Broglie, though very ingenious and interesting, has not supplied much additional light ; but he has analysed and described the Christian character of his state-policy with consummate skill. From the first edict of toleration (now lost) in which Christians were but admitted to the same freedom of religious profession that was accorded to all other citizens of the Roman Empire, Constantine proceeded to the special decree which secured to them the restitution of the churches and other property which had been confiscated to the state, or appropriated by private cupidity. Decrees soon followed, visiting with definite penalties all who should insult their worship or molest them in its exercises. Then came immunities, privileges, and exemptions for their clergy ; grants of buildings for their worship ; honours and offices for themselves ; till at length the state of sufferance entirely passes away, and the Church appears, no longer tolerated but honoured, not merely recognized, but triumphant.

It is a curious illustration of the undefined position

which he occupied, that, from the very first, Constantine is found interposing his authority in the internal affairs of the Church, to which he is as yet but imperfectly, if at all affiliated. Of this the appeal of the Donatists is a well-known example. M. de Broglie narrates it in ample detail, and distinguishes very clearly the separate stages of the affair, which have been too frequently confounded together. After narrating the first steps by which the matter was brought under the notice of Constantine by the complainant Donatists, and his reference of it to the decision of the Pope, assisted by Bishops from Gaul and Italy, he passes to the appeal of the Donatists against the decision of this tribunal. The Donatist bishops represented that the case had not been tried upon its real grounds; and as their new appeal involved a distinct question of fact;—namely, whether Felix, the Bishop of Aptunga, by whom Cæcilian (the Bishop of Carthage, whose election was the great subject of controversy,) had been guilty of the crime of *traditio*—giving up the sacred books during the persecution, Constantine referred this for investigation to the government of Africa Ælian.

“A truly singular spectacle, and full of significance for all, was this proceeding—the trial of a bishop for an act purely religious, which the Church alone could appreciate, and which but a short time before had been not merely permitted, but commanded by the civil law. The question to be tried was, whether, during the persecution, the Bishop Felix had been guilty of obeying the imperial edict, and of yielding to the threats of the magistrates. Submission was now imputed to him as a crime, before the very tribunal at which a little before this very submission had been extorted by violence. Nothing could attest more clearly the complete victory of the Church over the confessed impotence of the State. The civil authority itself undertook to establish that the resistance which had been offered to it was just and meritorious, and the fasces only presented themselves in order to bow down before the cross. That nothing might be wanting to this striking and solemn contrast, the civil officers were cited; and testified, to the honour of Felix, that he had had the courage to resist them. Alpheus, Edile of Aptunga, attested on oath that when, ten years before, he presented himself at the Church of the Christians, Felix was absent, and that they gave up to him nothing but some letters of no value. His accuser, the Donatist Ingentius, convicted publicly of perjury, only escaped torture because his rank as decurion protected him from every infamous penalty. Felix, like Cæcilian on the former occa-

sion, was solemnly acquitted of the charge of having burnt the sacred books."—Vol. I. pp. 278-9.

The conduct of Constantine on this occasion is, in some sense, the type of the general character of his later policy in the Arian controversy.

"Fortified, as he now was, by a spiritual sentence and a civil judgment, it would seem as if Constantine had only to strike one of those blows of authority which came so easy to him, in order to extinguish this flame of division which had been lighted in the very bosom of unity, and which had caused him so much anxiety and annoyance. But from the moment when there was question of the Christian Church, and the Christian religion, this imperious and resolute spirit appears all at once struck with hesitation and scruple. Consciousness of a right, foreign, if not superior to his own—respect for a truth which he feared without thoroughly comprehending—the majesty of a body which only accepted even his benefits with dignity and independence; all filled him with involuntary fear. He was resolved to do for the re-establishment of the peace of the Church, everything except to give laws to herself. His impatience was restrained by the fear of a sacrilegious usurpation; and with more of zeal than of knowledge, he referred anew to her more than once, in order to be sure to act in liberty of conscience at the order of a legitimate authority. Such did he always show himself through the long religious contests which desolated his reign; ardent in taking a side in the Church, but prompt in changing it; never wearied, yet never fixed; indefatigable, yet unsteady; ready to employ violence to serve religion, but never to domineer over her. There is nothing that displays more vividly the simple, sincere, often even rude, character of his faith. This great man, ordinarily so jealous of his authority, in relation to the Church only showed himself restless and impatient to obey the legitimate authority."—Vol. I. p. 280.

The account of the subsequent proceedings in this dispute, and especially of the Council of Arles, is very interesting. M. de Broglie places in the clearest light the true nature of the reference of the case to that tribunal; and, without alluding to it expressly, completely cuts away, by the simple recital of the authentic proceedings, all the grounds of the argument against the supreme and final authority of the Roman Pontiff, which the Anglican writers, since the days of Barrow, have delighted to draw from it.

We wish it were in our power to follow M. de Broglie through his history of the still more important controversy

of Arianism, and especially through his personal sketches of the eminent men who were its moving spirits—Osius and Athanasius on the one side, the two Eusebiuses on the other. The author, of course, deals principally with the external history of the controversy, but its doctrinal relations also are fully considered by him, and the view which his work presents of the origin of Arianism, of the principles, philosophical and theological, in which it had its rise, and of the intellectual tendencies which prepared its way, is not only eminently calculated to interest the ordinary reader, but may even suggest many subjects of thought to the philosophical or theological student. The sketch of Eusebius the historian, and that of St. Athanasius, are particularly striking. Dom Gueranger considers the latter cold and unsympathizing; but we cannot agree in this view. On the contrary, having always looked upon the character of Athanasius by Gibbon, and his whole sketch of the career of that Father as, in many respects, one of the most dangerous and seductive portions of the *Decline and Fall*, we cannot but regard the portraiture of the saint by the Prince de Broglie as a most useful and valuable counterpoise to this dangerous tendency. Like that of Gibbon, it is conceived from the philosophical, rather than the theological point of view, and thus it meets the infidel historian on his own ground, and, we cannot but think, with complete success. It is calm and unimpassioned, it is true, but we recognize in it, throughout, a tone of sincere and cordial sympathy, as well as of deep and respectful admiration; and in our judgment, the effect of both these qualities upon the minds of the readers for whom M. de Broglie principally writes, is much heightened by the very calmness and moderation, which to Catholic readers may seem cold and spiritless.

On the disputed portions of the personal history of Constantine;—as his treatment of Licinius, his conduct in reference to the death of Crispus, the punishment of Fausta, his relations with the Arian party, and many other points, the author has examined with great care all the best sources of information; and in general his views are solid and judicious, and always put forward in striking and picturesque language. There is one question, nevertheless, that regarding the time of Constantine's baptism, in which, although we agree with him in the opinion that it was deferred until the day of the emperor's

death, and that it was administered at Nicomedia by Eusebius, yet we think he has not done justice either to the supporters of the opposite view, (which supposes that he was baptized at Rome by St. Sylvester many years before,) or to the arguments and authorities on which it rests.

But for these and many interesting particulars we must refer the reader to the author's own work, which we cannot but believe must ere long appear in an English translation. We can only find room for one extract more ;—the passage in which he sums up the results of the career of Constantine, and contrasts the aspect of the Roman Empire as that emperor found it, with that which it presented when he was called away by death.

"Constantine had lived sixty-three years, two months, and twenty-four days ; he had reigned thirty years, nine months, and twenty-seven days. In the course of this life and this reign the Empire had changed both its form and its spirit. If posterity measured glory by the importance of the services rendered, the renown of Constantine would be without equal in the world, for no sovereign ever had a share in a more important and beneficent constitution. The place assigned to Constantine, however, in the memory of men is not so high as this. His name has remained, a subject of curiosity and controversy, much more than of admiration. He has not taken a place among that small number of great men whose genius causes their crimes to be forgotten. The instrument of the triumph of a doctrine whose destiny it is to remain an eternal sign of contradiction among men, he had been an object of violent hatred, of sincere love, and of base adulation. This is the lot of all who outrage or who flatter ardent passions. The gratitude has passed away ; the enmities alone have survived with all the fervour of their origin. More than one unbelieving writer has been found to repeat the calumnies of Zosimus ; no Christian would venture to compromise himself by re-echoing the complaisances of Eusebius. If the Oriental Church, leading the way to schism by servility, has not feared to raise the Christian Cæsar upon her altars, Rome, more proud, without being less grateful, in her relations to the powers of the earth, has never hesitated while she retained a grateful memory of his services, to visit him with the censure which he had deserved.

"This judgment of modern ages, so different from the contemporary admiration, is explained by the very difference of the point of view from which men contemplated him. To maintain in peace and submission for thirty years an Empire which had just passed out of half a century of anarchy ; to exhibit the image of Augustus or Trajan to men who had only known soldiers oftentimes raised up

as suddenly as they were thrown down; to make the salutary weight of authority felt by a generation which had been nurtured in civil conflict, and whose eyes had opened only to behold battle and punishment; this was no small evidence of genius. The people who drew breath under the shadow of this unexpected protection were but indulging a natural illusion when they mistook for a revival of glory what was but a temporary check on the fatal declivity of decay. But the event has undeceived the world. The abyss which was closed by Constantine opened anew under the very feet of his sons. Indulgent as it is for the happy boldness of the youth of nations, posterity has neither sympathy nor justice for the ungrateful struggles of their decrepitude. The imperial organization of Constantine, more enduring than illustrious—made rather to pass through than to prevent the ages of social corruption;—to supply the want of civic virtues by a skilful mechanism, not to revive them, offers nothing that can speak to the imaginations of men. It might have been a necessity and even a benefit, but it never will be a title to glory, to have founded the Byzantine empire.

“ In emancipating the Church and sharing his throne with her, Constantine produced a work more fruitful, and one whose results still surround us. He inspired with Christian wisdom those mighty Roman laws which still form the foundation of all our societies; he deposited in the bosom of dying civilization the germ of its resurrection. And yet such is the danger of the alliance of human power, that the Church, free and powerful with Constantine, often appears to the eye of the beholder less touching than the obscure and persecuted Church of the first ages; her brow shines with a lustre less luminous and less pure under the imperial diadem than under the *nimbus* of the martyr. Persecution drives away all impure elements from the bosom of the Church: credit and favour invite and develope them. The ardour of internal dissensions, the baseness of courtier prelates, the intermixture of human passions, the unhappy interposition of force into the controversies of religion, have made even Christians ask, whether Constantine had rendered to their faith a service which may be regarded as a subject of unqualified gratitude. Let us beware, however, of pushing too far a pusillanimous doubt which is injurious both to the Church and to humanity. The destinies of the earth would be cruel, indeed, if truth and virtue could not triumph even for a day, without losing their holy efficacy; and it would be a doctrine truly powerless for good which should be incapable of governing men without itself becoming corrupt. If, on the one hand, persecution has its uses in passing through the crucible the courage and virtue of individuals, it is success; on the other, triumph is the true touchstone of institutions and of ideas. In despite of schisms which have never entirely eclipsed its light—in despite of inevitable abuses which have sprung from human weakness, and against which even doctrinal infallibility is no safeguard;—the Church for fifteen centuries has been pass-

ing through this ordeal. In permitting her to diffuse through a thousand different channels the treasures of dignity, truth, and love, which she sustained in her bosom, Constantine hastened by some years the progress of the world. This is the highest reward that could be granted to the efforts of man."—pp. 376-9.

With this noble passage we must take leave of the *Regne de Constantin*. It is but a part of the great work to which the Prince de Broglie has so laudably devoted his great talents and rare learning. For the part which still remains we can almost believe that his studies and habit of mind are even more eminently suited. We shall look forward anxiously for the volumes of the continuation.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

- I.—*The Creator and the Creature ; or, the Wonders of Divine Love.*
By Frederick William Faber, D.D. Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London, Dublin, and Derby, Richardson and Son, 1857.

The last, and in some respects, the most remarkable, of Father Faber's theological works. It appears too late in the quarter for an article, and no attempt can even be made to do justice to it in a passing notice. Before our next publication, both we and our readers must try and make time to study it, and at the expiration of the interval, we may hope to return to it with greater advantage. Those who know "All for Jesus" and "Growth in Holiness," will read "The Creator and the Creature;" so it is a waste of words to say that they ought to do so. But the fact is, that the present volume furnishes a kind of key to the interpretation of its immediate predecessors, in giving the great leading idea upon which they have proceeded. The "Creator and the Creature," however, is any thing but an easy book; it is obviously the result of years of patient research, and habitual meditation. But all that a perfect mastery over the English language can do towards elucidating a deep subject, the reader will be prepared to find in any

work of Father Faber's, and will certainly find in this. Moreover, the harder parts of the treatise are relieved by passages of the most luxuriant poetical beauty.

II.—*The Catholic Handbook.* A History of the Metropolitan Missions, with a description of one hundred Churches and Chapels of the Dioceses of Westminster and Southwark. London: C. Dolman, 1857.

We have long felt the want of a useful guide book to the Missions in and near London, but we confess that the work before us is in no way calculated to supply that want. It is one of the most careless compilations that we have seen for a long time. It proceeds upon no consistent plan that we can discover, while the information with which it professes to favour us is, for the most part, meagre and uninteresting to the last degree. We are also sorry to be obliged to add, that it has never been our lot to read a printed book which betrayed so complete an ignorance of the English language as the volume now before us. It abounds in errors of grammar so numerous and so elementary, as to make us wonder how any one with ordinary education could have fallen into them. Let our readers turn to pages 11, 21, 31, 109, 112, 113, 116, and 119, of the "*Catholic Hand Book*," and they will find some glaring and almost ludicrous instances of bad grammar, incorrect English, and gross inattention to the laws of punctuation. Our space will not permit us to make more than one extract, which, however, is amply sufficient to establish the justice of the censure that we have felt it a duty to pass upon this work. The compiler describes the state and progress of the mission at Reigate in the following words:—

"In the year 1851, mass was for the first time restored by the Rev. Dr. Manning, at Prudell Court, [it should be Pendell Court] the residence of his brother Mr. Charles James Manning, on whose return with his family from Italy in 1853, was established; [what?] and opened an oratory there and since that period, [observe the punctuation] within the space of less than three years, the holy Sacrifice has been offered by the bishop of the diocese, [sic] and nearly thirty different priests. The establishment of this mission is a proof of how much might [sic] be done for religion, with even small beginnings, and, it is to be hoped, will prove an incentive to others to build at least an altar, where perhaps they are unable, at once, to erect a church or place the mission on a proper footing. During the harvest season, numbers of

poor Catholics seek employment in the country, and it was [sic] with no common pleasure that the pious originator of this mission rode from place to place seeking them out, and finding that the poor, desolate Catholics received with joy the announcement, that near them was then to be found an altar and a priest."

Here the sentence comes to an untimely end. We are not told what follows upon "the pious originator's" finding that the poor received with joy the tidings of a neighbouring altar and church. We have in fact only one part of a sentence, the rest is in nubibus.

"Since that period a regular mission has been established, about three miles distant, at Redhill, near the station of the Brighton and South Eastern lines of railway, by Lady Mostyn. That excellent lady is devoting herself with unbounded energy and charity."

We are not told to what good work it is that this excellent lady is devoting herself. We must supply the omission from our own imagination.

"Already the congregation numbers one hundred and fifty or more, and the good Abbé Reinaud, by his and [sic] indefatigable exertions, has given consolation to many a troubled mind, and cheerfulness to the desolate hearth; at present the chapel is an outbuilding in Lady Mostyn's grounds, and though temporary, is carefully and nicely fitted, and the altar beautifully dressed and cared for."

This extract is a fair sample of the entire book; and we can only express a hope, that if, as the author threatens us, we are to be inflicted with an annual re-issue of this Hand-book, the period intervening between the present publication and that of next year may be spent by the compiler in a diligent study of the rudiments of the English tongue. It is time that men should bear in mind, that all Catholics are not called upon to turn authors, and that in fact, a Catholic may be a most pious, estimable, and useful member of society, without the necessity of appearing in print, to bring disgrace upon himself, and to provoke the angry criticisms of outraged common sense.

III.—*The Genius of Christianity, or, the Spirit and Beauty of the Christian Religion.* By Viscount de Chateaubriand. Translated from the Author, with Preface, Notes, and Biographical Notice of the Author, by Charles J. White, D.D. (Second Edition). London: Dolman, 1856.

The translation of Chateaubriand's masterpiece, is really a great undertaking; not only for the service rendered to literature and religion, by making it more generally accessible, but on account of the difficulty of the task. Those who are acquainted with this writer, will be aware that although his style has all the apparent simplicity which is given by high polish and purity of idiom, it is still quite the writing of a poet, meant not merely to express the writer's thoughts, but to enhance them by the delicate word-painting which it requires nice appreciation and great skill to render into another language. Yet not in some degree to succeed in this, would be to fail in doing justice to a work avowedly addressed to the feelings and to the imagination as much as to the reason. The Author has given us the plan of his work in the following quotation from Pascal. "With those who have an aversion for religion, you must begin with demonstrating that it is not contradictory to reason; next show that it is venerable, and inspire them with respect for it; afterwards exhibit it in an amiable light, and excite a wish that it were true; then let it appear by incontestable proofs that it is true; and lastly, prove its antiquity and holiness by its grandeur and sublimity." This idea has originated in a deep knowledge of the human heart; it is not new to us in one form or another; it is the object which Mr. Digby has pursued in all his works, with far greater research and originality than Chateaubriand, with a wealth of illustration to which the great French writer can make no pretension, and a depth of poetic beauty which he has not surpassed. The peculiar merit of the *Genie du Christianisme* is the rapidity of its style, the power of its condensation which is combined with all the embellishment of a luxuriant imagination. It is difficult in our short space to give an idea of the multitude of topics touched upon in this work, or rather the variety of aspects in which the subject, in itself so vast, is presented to the reader; the whole system of Christianity, its mysteries, sacraments, and laws, are set forth, and their fitness and grandeur

vindicated ; the influence of Christianity upon the world at large, upon politics, morals, philosophy, science, literature, the fine arts ; upon the material prosperity of nations, its worship with all its beauties and harmonious accordance with the wants of men. The Existence of God, proved from His own works, the immortality of the soul, as evidenced by the very nature of man ; the Scripture history of the human race, with all its corroborations ; all these great subjects are touched upon and developed into ramifications which we cannot give. The Author does not insist, does not argue ; it is not his purpose to excite opposition ; he makes his point, heightens its effect by contrasts taken from Pagan or Infidel philosophy, and passing on to the next topic, brings from that also a new ray of light to bear upon the magnificence of his subject. Upon the wonders of creation bearing witness to the power and goodness of God, Chateaubriand pauses ; the recollections of the traveller rush upon him, nights and days spent in the fairest scenes of earth and the loneliest, supply him with exquisite imagery, and we are carried away by the beauty of his style. Again he yields to his feelings, when, in a last appeal to those of his readers, he dwells upon the supernatural charity of the clergy and religious orders, and, as a crowning instance, classifies their different missions to the heathens, giving a most happy summary of their labours, sufferings, and achievements. We can readily believe the effect produced by such a work as this upon its first appearance, nor do we doubt its importance at the present time. Chateaubriand wrote for the "Philosophers" of the French Revolution ; his book is the very "low water mark" of infidelity ; had he written now, his argument might have received some modifications, but against every error into which he has incautiously fallen, Dr. White has guarded us. As a translator, he has done justice to the spirit and the beauties of his Author, and by his notes and annotations, has added greatly to the value of the work.

IV.—*The Chinese Mother* ; a Drama. Richardson and Son, London, Dublin, and Derby.

This drama is certainly more Christian than Chinese, although the scene of it is laid in China, to which country most of the personages belong. But this perhaps, is to be

more critical than the occasion requires. An incident has been selected which might doubtless find many a parallel in the annals of the wonderful missions of that strange country. This story is pleasingly represented, and will excite the sympathy of the young, for whose benefit it was intended.

V.—*Alice Sherwin ; a Historical Tale*, by C. J. M. London : Burns and Lambert.

We can heartily recommend this story to our readers as one of great merit. The period of the tale is during the life of Henry VIII.; it commences with the riots of the "Evil May Day," and continues through that critical period when the King, determined upon the divorce of his Queen, was bearing down all opposition by his cruelty; when violence had succeeded to craft, and the reign of iniquity had begun. The Author has thoroughly entered into the spirit of the times, and his work has all the freshness and zest of a narrative of recent occurrences. The great characters of the day,—the King and Queen, Wolsey, Campeggio, Fisher, Sir Thomas More, and others, are freely introduced; the records of the time have been searched for details of their lives and conversation, and those smaller incidents in their career which are so full of interest, and indeed of edification; for, we need not say that the Author has taken the just and catholic view of these times; and their boisterous gaieties and rough splendour are well contrasted with the under current of struggle, and fear, and anguish,—and as these become unavailing, the deaths of the martyrs close the scene solemnly. With these greater events are mixed up the fortunes of humble characters; a good stirring story, which is set off, and not encumbered, by considerable antiquarian knowledge.

VI.—*The Convert Martyr ; a Drama in Five Acts*, arranged from Callista, by F. C. Husenbeth, D.D. London : Burns and Lambert, 1857.

Dr. Husenbeth has done good service to the public, and especially to the young, in giving them this elegant drama: his materials were indeed rich, and he has done justice to them by his judgment in selection, and his skilful arrangement of them.

VII.—*The Heiress of Morden: A Tale of our own Times*, by Stephen Wells. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

This is an interesting and edifying Catholic tale, of fair ability, and undoubted good tendency. Though called a tale, it consists of little more than a narration of facts, which, of course adds to the interest of the story, and gives it a reality which it must otherwise have lacked. Such works are obviously calculated to be useful, and it is to be regretted that we have not more Catholic books of a similar character and tendency.

VIII.—*A Few Sweet Flowers collected from the writings of St. Teresa*. By the Very Rev. Canon Dalton. Dublin: James Duffy.

Our best acknowledgments are due to Canon Dalton for the many admirable selections from the writings of St. Teresa which he has given to the public, not the least valuable of which is the little volume now before us. Cardinal Wiseman has observed, "that Spain can defy the world to produce a woman equal in intellect, in energy, in elevation of thought, and solidity of judgment to the incomparable St. Teresa;" whose works are eminently practical, and suited for popular use. This little book contains narrations and maxims of the Saint for the different days of the week, and we have much pleasure in recommending it to our readers.

IX.—*Sir Robert Peel, a Type of Statesmanship*. By Jelinger Symons, Esq. London: Longman, Brown, Green, &c., 1856.

The object of this work is not to exalt, but to degrade Sir Robert Peel from the honours of statesmanship. Indeed, the title is altogether a misnomer, for this attack is not upon his statesmanship; each of the great acts which he succeeded in passing, is admitted to have been necessary, wise, beneficial in itself, and to have been carried through with consummate ability. Sir Robert Peel is accused of dishonesty, and to have given dexterous plausibility to a false charge against a great and good man, is the only merit we can award to the author.

It is affirmed that during his earlier career, while holding office in Ireland, Sir Robert brought forward no good measures, nor took any sound views of Irish policy; this is true,—this was indeed the blemish upon his statesman-

ship, and thus he lost that gratitude and affection which would have been balm to his after life. He was a tory, one of those to whom Catholic ascendancy was alike odious, politically or religiously; and with him as with others, every effort to legislate or to do good, was impeded by this question. But he changed his mind; yes, here was the difference between him and others, there was not (as our author admits,) any bitterness in his temper, any gall in his heart, and consequently, he was not obstinately blinded by his prejudice. When circumstances proved that Catholic Emancipation was needed by the nation, he conceded it; and the proof of his conviction was in the large, and generous, and faithful way in which he acted up to it. Very similar were the circumstances when Sir Robert Peel carried the Repeal of the Corn Laws. But Mr. Symons alleges, first, that Sir Robert was too wise not to have always seen the folly of the politics which he in early life adopted; secondly, that he changed his opinions concerning them some years before he professed to do so; thirdly, that he never changed his opinions at all, but altered his line of conduct for the sake of keeping office. To the first we answer, that Sir Robert was not before the times in his opinions, he was a tory, not by party only, but by habit of mind,—he was a politician of a period when change was particularly abhorrent to men's minds, and when the great events by which the very existence of the nation was compromised, had prevented the due consideration which was afterwards given to minor questions of national policy. To the second we reply, that truth seldom comes in a flash of lightning, upon the unwilling, yet conscientious mind, conviction comes but slowly; but that a deliberate intention was fraudently concealed, to the detriment of public interest and private honour, is a thing to be not lightly received of any man, utterly incredible of Sir Robert Peel. As to the third charge, of his determination to hold office at any cost, it refutes itself. Why should he have so determined? As leader of the opposition, the idol of the Protestant and landed interest party, Sir Robert would have held a position, perhaps as powerful, certainly more gratifying to his feelings and his pride, than that which he afterwards occupied. We shall not pause to notice the insinuation that Sir Robert's father was enriched by the return to cash payments, nor to examine the questions in which he is disapproved by

Mr. Symons. The opinion of his eminent contemporaries, the regret, the gratitude, and admiration of his country, the fame which is building itself solidly up around his name and memory, reduce all such attacks as these to insignificance. Catholics are divided. For ourselves we remember the year 1829, the thrill of exultation and joy with which we heard that our cause was espoused by Sir Robert Peel, the manly courage and firmness with which he carried it through, and the storm of obloquy which then, and for long after he endured upon account of it. And if other less pleasant memories are connected with his name, our gratitude consigns them to oblivion.

X.—1. *The Lily of Israel ; or the Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary.* Translated from the French of the Abbé Gerbet. London, Dublin, and Derby : Richardson and Son.

2.—*Nine Considerations on Eternity.* By Jerome Drexelius, S. J. Translated from the Latin of the Bavarian edition, by F. Robert, of Mount St. Bernard's. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

Both these works will be very acceptable in an English dress, and the translations seem to be carefully made. This is the fifth edition of the life of the Blessed Virgin—a sufficient proof of its appreciation; and we are indebted for the *Considerations on Eternity* of the holy Jesuit Drexelius, to good Father Robert of St. Bernard's Abbey, who dedicates his very creditable translation to the Bishop of Shrewsbury. We are glad to see that amongst their various good works, and the anxieties connected with their admirable Reformatory, the good monks can find some time for literary labours; and F. Robert deserves our thanks for his opportune addition to our Catholic works. Drexelius teaches us, first, what is Eternity; in what things nature represents it; in what the ancient Romans placed their view of Eternity; how David meditated upon it, and why we should imitate him; how even the wicked have thought of eternity; in what manner Holy Scripture and the Fathers teach us to meditate upon it; how Christians are accustomed to depict it; and how it should constitute their profound meditation; concluding with some wholesome reflections. We can confidently recommend this work to our readers.

- XI.—*Usury, Funds, Banking, &c.* By Jeremiah O'Callaghan, Catholic Priest. New York: 1856.

We have read with interest the introduction to this work, the author's "narrative of his trials and travels in regard to usury," wherein with great simplicity, the good man puts himself and his cause entirely "out of court." For the question of usury, dissection of the dead for the purposes of science, and other points which he had so much at heart; he had no notion of considering, except as to their lawfulness in the eye of God and His Church. Nevertheless, although bishops condemned, good men advised and remonstrated, and the Holy See silenced him; nothing could turn him from his own views. He had no thought of rebelling against the authority of the Church, but that authority when brought to bear upon his theories, he somehow could not perceive: but evaded it with a pious perversity which would be laughable, were not the whole tenor of the narrative so sad; for Mr. O'Callaghan appears to be a man of zeal, learning and piety, who has suffered much and fruitlessly.

- XII.—1. *A Memorial of the late Archbishop Sibour of Paris.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

- 2.—*A Catechism for First Communion.* Translated from the French, and revised by the Very Rev. Dr. Pagani. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

- 3.—*A Manual of Prayers before, during, and after Mass, for Schools.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

The first of the above publications is a very beautiful mortuary paper, (an excellent specimen for such announcements, which can be supplied with blanks) put forth as a memorial of the late Archbishop of Paris, with the address of the Chapter on his violent death at the back. Many persons will be glad to possess this paper, which is appropriately illustrated, and may be obtained for a few pence.

A Catechism of first Communion, revised by Dr. Pagani, needs only to be mentioned to be recommended; and the same remark applies to the Manual of Prayers for Schools, which is published with the *Imprimatur* of the Bishop of Nottingham.

XIII.—*The Last Judgment.* A Poem, in Twelve Books. London : Longmaus, and Co., 1857.

The Last Judgment is one of those subjects the very awfulness of which has hitherto defied the powers of human language. We regret to say that the poem now before us is no exception to the past experience. It has nothing to recommend it beyond the beauty of its typography.

XIV.—*Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders.* By Edward Shortland M.A. London : Longman, &c., 1856.

But little, we are told, is known of the superstitious practices of the New Zealanders ; nor can we regret our ignorance. The manners and the language of a savage people may usefully afford some means of tracing out their origin : but their superstitions have one uniform character of debasement and puerility. Those of the New Zealanders are no exception ; they form indeed a marked contrast to the good sense which these people shew in all practical matters, in which they have proved themselves to be possessed of spirit and discretion, willing to learn, able to care for, and to defend themselves ; and to “hold their own,” as the phrase is, even in presence of civilization. Perhaps we are the less inclined to appreciate the information Mr. Shortland does give us,—however copious, and doubtless accurate of its kind—because we are disappointed of that which we should have desired from one who knew the country well. We should have liked to hear of the change made in the social condition of these Islanders by the introduction of the new, ennobling principle of Christianity, of their improvement, of their present state and prospects. Perhaps our reluctance to be contented with a record of the superstitions which, we had hoped, even themselves had rejected as childish, makes us blind to the importance of their preservation. Others have formed a different opinion, for this work has reached its second edition.

XV.—*Two Methods of Reciting the Beads, or Crown of our Lord Jesus Christ*, with an account of the Indulgences granted for that purpose. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

We are indebted to a member of the Congregation of the Passion for this little publication (abridged and translated from the French) the object of which is explained by the title. There seems to be a growing feeling that such simple methods of devotion are on every account the best, even for educated persons; and certainly none have been more encouraged by the Church. The devotions to which indulgences are attached are short, simple, and fervent; and Rosaries have the special recommendation that they are comprised of the best of all prayers (to which these characteristics especially belong),—the *Paternoster* and *Ave Maria*, which come to us from the very highest source.

XVI.—*Living Celebrities*. A series of Photographic likenesses of eminent public characters, with biographical notices. Maull and Polyblank, 55, Grace-church Street, and Richardson and Son, 147, Strand.

Probably many of our readers are acquainted with these admirable photographs, and to them no recommendation will be needed. The last number of the series contains an excellent likeness of the Cardinal Archbishop (the only divine who has appeared) which is considered the best that has yet been published. Nothing, certainly, could be more successful, or more pleasing; and it is put forth at such prices as place it within the reach of every one. The following biographical notice which accompanies the portrait, and may be relied upon as authentic, deserves a place in the *Dublin Review*.

“CARDINAL NICHOLAS WISEMAN was born on the 2nd August, 1802. He is descended from an English family on the father's side; on his mother's from the Stranges of Aylwardstown Castle, Kilkenny, where his mother was born. Many relatives of both his parents were long resident as merchants at Cadiz and Seville, where he himself was born. He sailed from Spain in the Melpomene frigate, Capt. Parker, and arrived at Portsmouth Jan. 1st, 1808. After having been at a boarding school in Waterford, he was sent in March, 1810, for his education, to St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, near Durham. Thence, he obtained leave to go as one of a first colony to the English College at

Rome, where he arrived Dec. 18th, 1818. The next year he had the honour of preaching before Pope Pius VII. There he pursued, with diligence, the usual course of philosophical and theological studies, at the close of which he held a public disputation on all theology, and received the Doctorship of Divinity, July 7th, 1824.

"He received holy orders the next spring. By Leo XII. he was named in 1827, Professor of Oriental languages, in the Roman University, Vice-Rector, and finally, in 1829, Rector of the English College. In 1827, he composed and printed a work entitled, *Horæ Syriacæ*, chiefly drawn from Oriental MSS. in the Vatican.

"Dr. Wiseman visited England in 1835; and in the winter of that year delivered a series of lectures, twice a week in Advent, at the Sardinian chapel, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

"In the Lent of the following year, by the desire of Bishop Bramstone, he vindicated, in a course of lectures delivered at St. Mary's Moorfields, the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church; and the London Catholics presented him with a gold medal, as an expression of their esteem and gratitude. These lectures were published, as also two volumes of 'Lectures on the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion,' and another on the Eucharist, in the course of that year. In 1840, the late Pope (Gregory XVI.) increased the number of Vicars Apostolic in England from four to eight; and Dr. Wiseman was named Coadjutor to Bishop Walsh of the Midland District, and Rector of St. Mary's College, Oscott. On the death of Bishop Griffiths, in 1848, Dr. Wiseman was made Pro-Vicar Apostolic of the London District, and subsequently Coadjutor to Dr. Walsh, (*cum jure successionis*.) on his translation to London. Bishop Walsh died in 1849, and Dr. Wiseman then became Vicar Apostolic of the London District. In August 1850, the Bishop was summoned to Rome; and in the following month the news of his elevation to the Cardinalate, and to the first place in the new Hierarchy, reached England. It was on the 29th September, 1850, that the Pope issued his Apostolic Letters establishing the Hierarchy, and a brief appointing Dr. Wiseman to the Archiepiscopal See of Westminster; and in a private consistory held on the following day the new Archbishop was raised to the dignity of Cardinal Priest, the ancient Church of S. Pudentiana being selected by him, for his title."

Our readers are aware that a collection of the Cardinal's Essays, from the *Dublin Review*, has been published in three volumes by Mr. Dolman.

Since the establishment of the Hierarchy, the Cardinal Archbishop has consecrated eight prelates,—Archbishop Errington, and Bishops Turner, Brown (of Shrewsbury), Burgess (R. I. P.), Roskell, Vaughan, Goss, and Vesque;

besides giving the abbatial mitre and benediction to the Abbot of Mount St. Bernard's.

XVII.—*Collections Illustrating the History of the Catholic Religion in the Counties of Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Somerset, Wilts, and Gloucester.* In two Parts, Historical and Biographical, with notices of the Dominican, Benedictine, and Franciscan orders in England. By the Very Rev. George Oliver, D.D. 8vo. London: Dolman, 1857.

Dr. Oliver's reputation as an ecclesiastical antiquarian is so long and so universally established that it is hardly necessary in order to recommend this his latest publication, to do more than announce the welcome news of its appearance. It has long been known that he was engaged in preparing the materials, and the "Collections" will fully realize the expectations to which the author's former works had given rise. It is in fact, (especially in the second Part) an exact counterpart in style, manner, and in execution of Dr. Oliver's admirable volume on the history of the Jesuit Society in Great Britain.

There is one difference between them. The Memoirs of the Jesuits were purely biographical, while the historical part of the present work comprises a history of the religious establishments, and also an account of the Catholic families in the district; but both of these, of course, include many biographical details, and especially such as bear upon the sufferings undergone for the faith in the dreadful times through which our fathers have handed it down to us.

The Biographical part, however, occupies the larger half of the volume, and it is this portion that exhibits most strikingly the remarkable industry and research which are the great characteristics of Dr. Oliver.

It comprises a vast number of biographies, from the sixteenth century downwards, many of them, it is true, meagre and fragmentary, but all in their way of infinite value to the future historian. As a large proportion of the biographical notices, not only fall within the memory of the living generation, but even embraces individuals still living, his task has often been a very delicate and difficult one; nor is it in the nature of things that, in such a community as ours, his notices should have given universal satisfaction, or that he should have gone through so vast a subject absolutely and entirely *inoffenso pede*. But while, on the one hand, it may safely be said that there is very

little in these Collections against which any reasonable exception can be taken, they will be found, on the other, to contain a mass of information which no other living man could command, and which would have been hopelessly and irrecoverably lost, had not Dr. Oliver devoted his life to its preservation.

XVIII.—*The History of Normandy and of England.* By Sir Francis Palgrave, K. H., Deputy Keeper of Her Majesty's Public Records. Vol. II. London: Parker and Son, 1857.

At length, after an interval of six years, Sir Francis Palgrave has published the second volume of his History of Normandy and England. The present is even more massive than its predecessor, extending to nearly a thousand pages. This enormous volume comprises, nevertheless, but a part of the history of the tenth century, resuming the narrative at the reign of Duke Rollo, and carrying it on only through those of the two succeeding Dukes. The author, however, holds out a promise that in the course of this and the next year, the third and fourth volumes shall follow in quick succession, completing the work.

The volume now before us, exhibits all the well-known peculiarities of the author, all his learning and research, all the beauties, the quaintnesses, and the excentricities which characterise him. Sir Francis, however, has reserved for the succeeding volumes, the continuation of the series of essays on the general relations of the Mediæval period which was prefixed to the first.

As the interest of the work, in our eyes, turns upon these essays, and on the questions which they involve, much more than on the personal details of the history of this obscure period, however full of life and force they appear in Sir Francis's brilliant pictures, we shall reserve till the completion of the work, the review of the entire which we have long contemplated.

XIX.—*Christianity and our Era.* A Book for the Times. By George Gilfillan, 8vo. Edinburgh: Hogg, 1857.

The doctrine of "Christianity and our Era" is briefly this;—that, although Christianity is divine, and *was* sufficient for the uses for which it was designed, yet that its day has passed, even as the day of Judaism passed before: that the new circumstances of the world render necessary

“ a new sublimer, stronger shape of the old thing ;” and, therefore, that we are to look forward to a final form of divine interposition, through a new coming of the Son.

This is not a view to be argued with in our pages. We merely state it as “ a sign of the times.”

XX.—*The Lives of the Chief Justices of England from the Norman Conquest till the Death of Lord Tenterden.* By John Lord Campbell, F.R.S.E. Vol. III. London : Murray, 1857.

This volume completes this great series of legal biographies, to which Lord Campbell has devoted the brief leisure of many years. The third and concluding volume of the Chief Justices contains the lives of Lord Kenyon, Lord Ellenborough, and Lord Tenterden. For the present we only record the completion of the work ; but we purpose, in our next number, to examine in detail, the entire series, which, in several of its parts, has been the subject of many, and not unimportant discussions.

XXI.—*The Rosary of Our Lord Jesus Christ.* By F. W. Faber, D.D. London, Dublin, and Derby : Richardson and Son.

We are glad to find that amongst his other reprints, Dr. Faber has not omitted to give to the Catholic public this excellent paraphrase from the Latin, which was first published fourteen years ago, while the author was yet an Anglican. The only alteration that seems to have been required was the omission of a somewhat startling invocation, (“ Hail *Jesus*, pray for us !”) which was repeated after every verse in the Protestant edition. This excellent Rosary is published at the lowest conceivable price, in a coloured wrapper, with an appropriate mediæval title.

XXII.—*Collected Poems.* By Sir Oscar Oliphant. London : Hope, 1856.

Sir Oscar Oliphant has not done himself justice ; a smirking portrait, and a defiant introductory notice, do not predispose the reader in favour of poems which require to be read with indulgence. For they have a good deal of the carelessness and flippancy natural to the pet productions of an amateur poet. They have, however, much which makes it worth while to overlook these blemishes ; they have power, originality, poetic talent of a high order ;

with many of the poems we have been greatly pleased, and can confidently recommend them to our readers.

XXIII.—*Modern Manicheism, and other Poems.* London : J. Parker, 1857.

Who is the author of these effusions ?

" A poet hidden
In the light of thought,
Singing hymns unbidden,
Till the world is wrought
To sympathy with hopes and fears it heeded not."

We have let the poet speak for himself, not being ourselves well able to appreciate his "unbidden hymns." Modern Manicheism is Theological, a stale protest against Calvinism, 'Labours Utopia' is an inflated Rhapsody, 'Love, an Ode' utterly unintelligible; the shorter pieces have more point, but only a very few of these repay the trouble of reading them.

XXIV.—*Eva, a Romance in Rhyme, and other Poems.* By Caroline Giffard Phillipson. London : Moxon, 1857.

We are unwilling to criticize a work of such slight pretensions. Amiable feeling, and a relish for beautiful imagery, form the sole recommendation of these little poems.

XXV.—*Kirwin, a Novel,* by Octavia Oliphant. London: Hope, 1856.

This novel has reached a second edition, greatly to our surprise; whether it has obtained favour in virtue of any former writings, by Octavia Oliphant, we are unable to say; but the work before us we cannot recommend. The incidents and characters are unpleasing, devoid of truth or nature. A great effort has been made at originality; and the result has been something very odd, to say the least of it. In fact, the style both of thought and expression are often preposterous and always vulgar.

XXVI.—*May Carols.* By Aubrey De Vere. London : Longman and Co., 1857.

Mr. De Vere is never so happy as in that most difficult of all subjects, Devotional Poetry, in which Johnson regarded success as unattainable. We have already, in

alluding to the exquisite sonnets contained in Mr. De Vere's volume of *Poems*, published two years since, endeavoured to point out the qualities of his mind, from which this remarkable aptitude for sacred poetry arises. His volume of 'May Carols' exhibits these qualities still more strikingly, and it would seem to us, with more complete unreserve.

The 'May Carols' is, in some sense, a Poetical Month of Mary. The subjects, if not exclusively devoted to our Blessed Lady, are at least grouped around her as a centre; and most of them tend to illustrate, either directly or indirectly, the true nature of that devotion to her, in which the Catholic, as it were, makes holiday in "the Blessed Month of May."

Having received the volume only on the eve of publication, we must be content with one or two extracts, as specimens, both of its devotional spirit, and of its poetical excellence.

There is great tenderness as well as dignity in the following protest against the misconstruction of our worship of the Blessed Virgin, which is common among Protestants.

"Who doubts that thou art finite? Who
Is ignorant that from the Godhead's height
To what is loftiest here below,
The interval is infinite?"

"O Mary! with that smile thrice-blest
Upon their petulance look down;—
Their dull negation, cold protest—
Thy smiles will melt away their frown!"

"Show them thy Son! That hence their heart,
Will beat and burn with love like thine;
Grow large; and learn from thee that art,
Which communes best with things divine.

"The man who grasps not what is best
In creaturely existence; he
Is narrowest in the brain; and least
Can grasp the thought of Deity."—p. 73.

We cannot deny ourselves the mournful pleasure of transcribing from the epilogue of the volume the following touching tribute to the memory of the ever-lamented Robert Wilberforce.

"The Sabbath comes ; the work-days six
Of Time go by ; meanwhile the key,
O Salutary Crucifix,
Of all the worlds, we clasp in thee !

"Truth deeper felt by none than him,
Who at the Alban mountain's foot
Wandering no more in shadows dim,
Lay down a lamb-like offering mute.

"His mighty love found rest at last
In Faith, and woke in God. Ah, Friend !
When life that is not Life is past,
Pray that like them may be my end.

"Thy fair large front ; thine eyes grave blue ;
Thine English ways so staid and plain ;—
Through native rosemaries and rue,
Memory creeps back to thee again.

"Beside thy dying bed were writ
Some snatches of these random rhymes ;
Weak Song, how happy if with it,
Thy name should blend in after times."

We had hoped to add one of the beautiful paraphrases of the titles of our Blessed Lady, '*Mater Christi*,' '*Mater Divinæ Gratiæ*,' '*Stella Matutina*,' &c., but we have already more than exceeded our allotted space. We regret the omission less, however, because we cannot doubt that '*May Carols*' will be speedily welcomed as a household book in every Catholic family.

XXVII.—*The Irish in England*. By William G. Todd, D.D.
Reprinted with Additions from the "Dublin Review." London :
Dolman, 1857.

It would not become us to speak as we should desire of this admirable reprint from our own pages. Would that the feelings of deep responsibility with which it was written—the awful sense of the dangers of our poor countrymen in England—the warm and ungrudging recognition of their many noble qualities, and the equally lively consciousness of their many shortcomings, were universal among those who have the power to aid in improving their condition, in correcting their faults, and fostering and developing their many admirable qualities !

XXVIII.—*Gwendoline and Winfred*. London : Moxon, 1857.

“ By a moss bank of softest green,
Where violets shed their odours sweet,
And purling brooklets run between
The groves of laurel at your feet,
From the chill winter's icy hand
Loosed to enliven all the land,
Which 'neath the Spring sun shone as bright
As tho' unknown the Frost King's might ;
Two maidens, lovely as a dream
Sat gazing on the warm sunshine—
Bright Winfred, with her eyes' rich gleam
And laughter-loving Gwendoline ;
On whose young brow of purest snow
Joy doth her sunny radiance throw ;
Enlivening with its sparkling grace
The tender beauty of her face.”

It is a very difficult thing to criticize poetry ; the slight material does not justify rough usage ; and while there is such happy difference in tastes, it seems hard to pass stern censure upon what is graceful and pleasing, because it lacks some higher qualifications. For this reason we have let this poem introduce itself. The two fair sisters are heroines of a tale in verse, of which these introductory lines are a fair specimen.

XXIX.—*Official Documents, connected with the Definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, in Latin and English, with a list of the Cardinals and Prelates present in the Basilica of St. Peter on the 8th December, 1854. Baltimore : Murphy. London : Dolman, 1855.

These documents consist of the two allocutions pronounced by our Holy Father Pius IX. on the 1st and on the 9th of December, 1854, and of the Letters Apostolic promulgated by him, declaring the definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception. They are noble compositions, worthy of the subject ; grand in their simplicity, full of authority and unction. We are glad to have them thus collected as a memorial of that memorable 8th of December, and as a vindication of the antiquity and truth of the glorious doctrine then finally decided.

XXX.—*Rosa of Tannenburg, a Tale of the Olden Time, for Parents and Children.* By Canon Von Schmid. London: Dolman, 1857.

This story will add to the obligations under which Canon Schmidt has laid his juvenile readers. It contains more incident than usual in his writings, and has real merit as a tale, independent of the value of its persuasive enforcement of holy feeling and religious duty.

XXXI.—*Adulterations Detected, or Plain Instructions for the Discovery of Frauds in Food and Medicine.* By Arthur Hill Hassall, M.D. London: Longman and Co., 1857.

It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of such a work as this; it attacks an evil almost universal, subtle and dangerous in the highest degree: it points out the methods by which the legislature might protect us from it; or if, as is probable, our government should consider the subject too insignificant to be worthy the wisdom and paternal care, for which it has doubtless more important objects, at least Dr. Hassall provides for individuals the means of, in some degree, guarding themselves against it, if they will take the trouble so to do. Not many, indeed, could use the laborious and scientific tests which the author has applied to almost every article in general consumption; but upon these are grounded a quantity of plain instructions and useful information, which cannot be too generally diffused. The suggestions made to the government for the measures best calculated to protect both the honest dealer and the public, by detecting and punishing adulteration, are admirable; they would be most effective, nor can we perceive any practical difficulty in carrying them out. We can but hope that these, or other measures equally suitable may be adopted. Surely nothing can be more urgent. It appears certain that everything we eat or drink, every article we consume, for nourishment, for stimulants, or for medicine, is mixed with foreign substances, most of them more or less poisonous. Who can tell how much of the dyspepsia, the valetudinarianism, the innumerable symptoms of a general "ailing" so prevalent in the present day, may be owing to this slow but continual process of deterioration? Again, what mean hypocritical wide-spread dishonesty is involved in such proceedings? it is painful to ourselves to reflect upon it; and how must our neighbours

and customers view this blot upon our commerce ! We must hope that this subject will be taken up in earnest by the government ; they can plead no lack of information or advice ; both have been supplied to them abundantly by different writers, but chiefly by the pains-taking, learned, and conscientious author of the work we now recommend.

XXXII.—*Maxims, Sayings, Exclamations of Love*, translated from the writings of St. Teresa, by the Rev. Canon Dalton. 2nd edition. London : Dolman, 1857.

We are glad to announce a second edition of this valuable little work, which we recommended to our readers on its first appearance.

XXXIII.—*A Discussion of the Question, Is the Roman Catholic Religion Inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty? and the Question, Is the Presbyterian Religion Inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty?* By the Rev. John Hughes, Catholic Priest, and the Rev. John Breckinridge, Presbyterian. Baltimore : Murphy, 1856.

We have not been able to do more than glance through this bulky volume; yet we think we can say that those who derive pleasure and excitement from these trials of intellectual skill, will find as much of both in these records as can reasonably be expected. The question was narrowed within practicable limits, the terms of discussion fairly settled, and the audience impartial. The Catholic champion, the Rev. John Hughes, is an acute and learned man, who did all possible justice to the cause of truth; but he was singularly unfortunate in his opponent; a shallower reasoner or more violent man we should not think America could produce. It is painful to see our holy religion held up and serving as a target for the vulgar jeering insolence of such a man; but if Mr. Hughes compelled himself to endure this, we will not name in comparison the personal attacks upon himself—we trust that he has been rewarded. To obtain an admitted or conclusive victory over so fraudulent and perverse a mind as that of his adversary, could not be in the power of any man; but his arguments must have impressed his hearers, and have doubtless proved to many of them a germ of truth, which will bear fruit hereafter.

XXXIV.—*Considerations on Divorce, a vinculo Matrimonii, in connexion with Holy Scripture.* By a Barrister. London: Stewart, 1857.

A sound and able argument upon a much vexed question, which is particularly seasonable at this time. The question of Divorce is considered solely with reference to the will of God as made manifest in Holy Scripture, and the texts which bear upon the subject are examined carefully, and commented upon with much acuteness and good sense. To Catholics, such a work is needless, the Church has given them (as she ever must) the true interpretation of Scripture; nevertheless, we rejoice in whatever may assist in giving a right direction to public feeling upon this subject, and have no doubt that this pamphlet will have considerable influence in doing so.

XXXV.—*The Church of the Fathers.* By John Henry Newman, D.D., of the Oratory. Dublin: Duffy, 1857.

Dr. Newman's work has been so long known and appreciated, that we have no occasion to do more than announce this new edition; it has received the author's last improvements, and is introduced in his own beautiful style.

XXXVI.—*The Mystic Crown of Mary, in verse.* By D. Rock, D.D. London: Dolman, 1857.

A beautiful little poem full of imagery and of feeling; it is written with life and fire, bearing the reader along with it in its flow. And Dr. Rock has enriched it with notes which we need not say, coming from his pen, are valuable.

INDEX TO VOL. XLII.

- Abon, Zeyd Hassan**, the Arab, confirms the early Christianity of China, 453.
- Acts**, English, easily extended to Ireland, 221.
- Altar**, alleged to be in the true interpretation only a decent and convenient table, 198—decided by Privy Council to be essentially different, 205—catholic altars constructed with a view to sacrifice, it required therefore to be immovable, 206—that at St. Barnabas to be taken down, 207.
- Alphonse**, St., his writings intended for the use of priests in the confessional, not of ordinary catholics.
- Andersen**, his tales, 5, 12—translation of, 11.
- Anglicans**, the, doctrines which they have given up, 114.
- Aristocracy**, protestant, brought about the revolution, 28—their motives, 29—characters given of them by their own historians, 45—their conduct when the revolution was accomplished, 66—pursue the same line of conduct under Anne, 75.
- Aventine Hill**, 160.
- Barnabas**, St., church of, controversy concerning, differs from most of the other controversies of the time, question merely of discipline, 195—but closely connected with doctrine, 196—Church of, its early history, 196—often been the subject of discussion, 196.
- Beal**, Mr., resident of the chapel district of St. Barnabas, procures a monition to be issued against Mr. Liddell and Churchwardens, 197.
- Beguines**, the, 240.
- Belgium**, its great characteristics, 230—its religious institutions, 231—morality of its inhabitants, 232.
- Beranger**, Chanson, on Wandering Jew, 186.
- Bigotry**, better in the sight of God than latitudinarianism, 484.
- Bill** of rights, 58—clause absolving subjects from their allegiance if the king be in communion with Rome, 63.
- Bill** for dissolution of marriage, allowing either party to marry again, opposed to catholic doctrine, 221.
- Bishop Felix**, remarkable trial, 509.
- Bisson**, Pere, Prior of St. Sabina, a painter of great merit, 162—carries on excavations in garden of monastery, 162.
- Bishops**, (petitioning) under king James, their acquittal and conduct 57.
- Books**, notices of, 249—514.
- Books**, Catholic, filled with expressions of interior devotion, 486.
- Bowring**, Sir John, his work on Siam, 384, 398—his praise of catholic missionaries, 399, 400.
- Broglie**, Prince de, his work bearing on the relation of Church and State, 490—too valuable to be briefly dismissed, ib.—historical introduction, 503—progress of Christianity, 502—contrast, 512.
- Buckingham**, Duke of, his fall, 33— anecdote of, ib.
- Buddhism**, its analogies with Christianity, 459 have been introduced since the Christian missions, 460.
- Burnet**, bishop, his authority quoted in judgment of Privy Council, 208.
- Cæsars**, palace, of the, on Palatine Hill, built for Augustus, enlarged by Tiberius, and extended by Nero as far as the gardens of Mæcenas, 166, 167—inscription on walls of, discovered by Father Garucci in 1856, 168.
- Cassander**, George, letter of, to Bishop Cox on the subject of crosses, 292.
- Catacombs**, various subjects treated on walls of, frequent allusions to the Sacrament of Penance and Holy Eucharist, 175—inscriptions found in cemetery of St. Callistus, referring to B Sacrament, 176—representation of Peter under the figure of Moses, 177—evidence afforded by, as to the frequent use of images by early Christians, 178—no representation found of the Crucifix, ib.
- Catholics**, how they should be considered by Anglicans, 107—what should be their proper part in politics, 228.
- Catholicism**, objections to, generally start from a false premiss, 482—the only fair way of judging by examining its principles and teachings, 486—many of its phenomena must remain a mystery, 489.
- Charity**, institutions for, 125—in Belgium, 231.
- Charity**, sisters of, origin of, 133.
- China**, its internal condition little known, 439—sources of information concerning, ib.—religion of, 441—introduction of christianity into, 443—account of, by Chinese authorities, 449.
- Christian** Remembrancer paper, its charge against Dr Newman, 105.
- Christians**, accused of worshipping an ass, passage from Tertullian on the subject, 171.
- Christianity**, its introduction into China, 453— anecdote of its extinction, 455.
- Church**, the, definition of, by Catholics, 322—parallel between our Lord and his church, 326, 330, 338, 360—protestant ideas of the church, 339—parallel between the heresies against Christ, and against his church, 340—parallel objections to the forgiveness of sins by man on earth, 341, 344—between the institution of the B. Eucharist and the reception of it, 345, 347—in the fear and hatred of the powers of the world, 347, 348—the true church the especial object of that fear, 349—parallel between our Lord and His church in their mutual correspondence with the Scripture, 354—instantiated in the use of the cross, 357—in the aspect of religion both present, 358—supernatural greatness of its character, 361.
- of England, absurdity of her political services, 26—signs in her of a coalition of opinions, 110—evils of such a movement, 112—presents no token of an organic body of any kind, 119.
- , Irish protestant, its destruction to be sought for by all catholics as a first object, 225—is as great an anomaly in the British Constitution as slavery in the United States, 225—question of its propriety to be always discussed, 226.
- Church**, Christian, her triumph in the reign of Constantine, and power of retaliation, 493—her mild policy, ib.—her adoption of all good in the Roman system, ib.
- Clergy**, the, their powers of civil government, 308.
- Communion**, service, its true nature discussed by lords of Privy Council.
- Communions**, average numbers of compared in catholic and protestant churches, 488.
- Compton**, bishop, his false swearing, 47.
- Consent** of Santa Sabina, 160.
- Constantine**, reign of, only a portion of the work on the church and Roman Emperor, 491—contains the solution of the conflict between the church and Paganism, ib.—historians of the Christian religion date from it, starting point of Gibbon's history, ib.

- Constantine*, Emperor, his great problem how to deal with paganism in the empire, 492—miraculous progress of Christianity during his reign, 502—contrast of the Empire at the beginning and end of his reign, 512
- Controversialist*, first duty to master the true position of his antagonist, 484.
- Controversy*, the best kind of, that which clears up facts, 483.
- Conversion* often involves real martyrdom, 490.
- Country* appealed to, really between Lords Palmerston and Derby, 213.
- Crime* of different nations, comparison difficult, 144—comparison between England and Ireland, 145.
- Cross*, the, use made of it by the catholic church, 357.
- Crosses* used in churches supposed by Sir J. Dodson to have been prohibited at Reformation, 201—Privy Council decides against this supposition, 202—that on the screen at St. Barnabas allowed to remain, 204.
- Deaconess*, protestant, society of, 125.
- Denison*, Archdeacon, 99—treatment he has met with, 100.
- Derby*, Lord, attempts to insult catholics by proclamation against processions, 223—evident intention to pursue protestant policy, *ib.* more likely to be courteous to foreign powers than Lord Palmerston, 228.
- Deportment*, external, danger of making the test of real piety, anecdote given, 486.
- Dodsworth*, Dr., opinion on Protestant delusions, 481—his views agree with those of F. Faber, 482—subjects noticed in his tract, 485.
- Discoveries*, antiquarian in Italy, 157, 159.
- Disease*, epidemic, history of, in Ireland, 82—records chiefly kept by ecclesiastics, 85—record of that in 1845, 86.
- Dodson*, Sir J., opinion on Church ornament, 100.
- Dore*, Gustave, illustration of legend of Wandering Jew, their grotesque nature, and mixture of the ludicrous and horrible, 187.
- Drama*, sacred might be introduced with advantage, 286.
- Droecher*, Martin, dissertations on Wandering Jew, 185.
- Edgiston* Mare's Nest, 483.
- English*, the, their national character changing, 278—or developing, 282, 285—is not what it was formerly, 283.
- Empire*, Rome, thoroughly pagan up to the reign of Constantine, 499.
- Engraving* on wood employed to illustrate Legend of Wandering Jew, 186.
- Ethics*, science of, 407, 408.
- Evangelists*, the, their errors of doctrine, 111.
- Faber*, Father, his opinion of the religious condition of English protestants, 481.
- Facts*, only real method of argument, 489—require to be read by the light of faith, *ib.* cannot always square with our theories of perfection, *ib.*
- Faàl*, Consular, light thrown on by excavations in Sta Sabina, 165.
- Fenwick*, Sir John, his trial, 71.
- Frazer*, Arvales, monuments of, discovered in founding new sacristy to St. Peter's, 164—fragment relating to, discovered at Sta Sabina 164.
- Frensch*, dissertation written by, on Wandering Jew, 185.
- Fry*, Elizabeth, her admirable works, 132—have left no result, *ib.*—contrasted with Katherine Macaulay, 133.
- Garucci*, Father, discoveries made by, on Palatine Hill, 166—finds Pagan inscription on walls on Caesar's Palace, 168—facsimile given, 169—learned work on the remains of Pompeii, 181.
- Geu* church, in Rome, daily number of communions, 428.
- Good*, the notion of, 410.
- Groffti*, inscriptions or figures on plaster, facsimiles of, collected by Father Garucci, 182.
- Grey*, Lord, one of the council of six, 47.
- Guardian* and Christian Remembrancer papers, their mode of treating Catholics, 103.
- Headlam*, Mr., motion to delay the Charitable Trusts Act, 211.
- Helps*, Mr., his Spanish conquest, 296.
- Hercules* Temple of, site identified, 163.
- History*, no longer an unbiassed catalogue of events, 494.
- Historians*, most modern, followers of some school, 494.
- Hospice*, St. Julien, 235.
- Hospital*, Buddhist, for animals, 458.
- House* of Commons, protestant members of, do not consider any religious question as local or circumscribed, 215—catholic members bound to consider every question affecting catholic interests in any part of the British Empire as one of interest to all, 215.
- Hue*, Pere, 441—translates the inscription of Si-guan-Fou, 446—defends its authenticity from Chinese authorities 450.
- Insane*, the, treatment of in Belgium, 234.
- Inscription* on walls of Caesar's palace, discovered and explained by Father Garucci, 170—attributed by him to reign of Severus, 171—passage on the subject in Tertullian's Apology, extract given, 171—date fixed by Father Garucci about the year 198, 173—evidence afforded by it of the belief of Christians in the close of the second century in the Divinity of Christ, 174—on the use and honour of images, *ib.*—on honour paid to the crucifix 178—supposed by Father Garucci to represent actual scene, argument used by him on the subject not conclusive, 179.
- Inscriptions*, collection of, entitled Kin-Che-Sul-Pien, 450—inscription of Si-guan-Fou, 444.
- Ireland*, her condition during the famine, 86—Famines periodical, 89—causes of this, 92.
- James III.* King, his accusers, their motives, 44—charges against him examined, 47—conspiracies against him, 51—was in truth forced from the country, *ib.*—his justification by all historians, 52—his interference with Magdalen College, 55.
- Jameison*, Mrs., her work on Charitable Institutions, 124, 126, 131, 137, 140.
- Jeffreys*, Judge, 53.
- Jew*, Wandering, legend of, illustrated by Gustave Dore, 183—first mentioned by Matthew Paris, 185—supposed to have been seen by an Armenian bishop, and described by him in 1228, 185—various appearances in succeeding centuries, 185.
- Jews*, their spiritual condition at the time of our Lord's coming likened to that of Protestants at the present day, 485—their inheritance of vain traditions, Our Lord's method of dealing with them, *ib.*
- Judgment* on affair of St. Barnabas really a double one, 196.
- Justice*, their power to send to an Industrial

School any child failing to obtain security for its good behaviour, 220.

- Kant*, his philosophy, 420.
King of Siam, 383—his letters to Sir John Bowring, 385, 400.
Lacordaire, le Pere, 243.
Laforest, M., his work on Moral Philosophy, 405—gives a general notion of Moral Science, 407—first part treating of general ethics, 410—his examinations of false systems, 419—treats of Right and Duty, 422—of Sanction, ib.—second or practical part of the work, ib.—objections to his system, 427.
Language, the, German, 2.
Languages, study, of, 3.
Las Casas, 296—instigates the King's preachers to oppose the Slavery of the Indians, 304—he and his monks convert an entire province, 312.
Law Moral, the nature and character of, 416—is the foundation of all positive laws, 419.
Liberality of the day contrives to except Catholics, 484.
Liddell, Mr., present Incumbent of St. Barnabas Church, 196.
Linen, embroidered, no longer to be laid on the Communion table, 208.
Lisle, Mrs., her trial, 53.
Lombard, Father, his controversy with F. Ricci's opinions on Chinese doctrines, 478.
Lushington, Dr., his Arguments from Rubric on Church ornament, 209.
Macaulay, Katherine, and the Order she founded, 133.
Man, his duties to God, 423—to himself, ib—to his fellow, 424.
Manuscripts, Medical, the earliest known in Ireland, 80.
Marini, Monsig., work 'on the Monuments of the Frates Arvales, collects inscriptions on that subject, 164.
Miche, Mgr., Bishop of Cambodia, 399.
Ministry, present, its foreign policy not to be approved, 228.
Milman, Dean, his treatment of Christianity after the reign of Constantine, 491—belongs to the Naturalist School of History, 496.
Missions, in Siam, 394—more successful with the Chinese there, than the Natives, 397—present state of Catholic missions there, 397—of those of the Protestants, 398—Jesuit in China, 443—modern in China, 462—Portuguese, 463.—interrupted by controversy, 477.
Monks, Dominican, in Hispaniola, their opposition to Slavery, 300.
Moral Theology of Catholics never understood by Protestants, 104.
Moral Philosophy, the word has two meanings, 423—how understood on the Continent, 404—scarce deserves the name of science, 408—is connected with other branches of philosophy, 409—its importance, ib.
Music, an increased love of, in England, 278.
Newman, Father, his opinion that a Protestant falsehood should never be allowed to remain unexposed, 483.
Northcote, Mr., admirable work on Catacombs, description of various subjects treated on their walls, 174—extract given, 175.
Oakeley, Canon, his "Church of the Bible," 319.

- Oratory*, the London, 284.
Ornaments, Church, those of St. Barnabas of a much more elaborate character than those of St. Paul's, 199—alleged to have been there since 1850, 199.
Origen, 504.
Osborne, Sir Thomas, 34—is made Earl of Danby, 35—intrigues with the Prince of Orange, 36—his devices concerning Oates Plot, 37.
Oxford, bishop of, his language with reference to the Holy Eucharist, 487.
Paintings, considered as a means of popular amusement, 287.
Pallegoix, Mgr., Catholic Bishop of Siam, 389.
Palatine Hill, has passed through many architectural phases, 166.
Palempst, 158.
Palmerston, Lord, neither whig nor radical, tory nor conservative—his policy difficult to be characterised, 211—how affected towards Catholics, 222—generally disposed to fair dealing with them, 223.
Pantheism, 421.
Parents, their power to object to the Industrial School proposed by magistrate—uselessness of this provision, 221.
Parliament, the Whig, before the Revolution, its character, 40-44.
Passaglia, Professor, his Scriptural proofs of the Church, 318.
Penitentiaries, English, contrasted with the "Refugio" at Turin, 128.
Petition, the, of the Bishops examined, 55.
Philip II., greatness of his Empire, 294.
Plates, on Wandering Jew, I. his sentence, 188—II., 189—III. and IV., 189—V. 190—VI., 190—VII., 191—VIII., 192—IX., 187—X., 193 XI., 193—XII., 194.
Plot, Titus, Oates' management of, 38—King James' opinion of it, 39.
Plot, the, Rye-House, names of its Authors, 41.
Police, may take into custody any child found begging in the streets, and without lawful home, and may detain it in prison for forty-eight hours, while enquiries are made, 219.
Politics, diversions of, three on which a Catholic member has to make up his mind, 214.
Pompeii, Article on, in Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, 181.
Popery, prejudice against, to be treated rather as acquiescence in traditional error than form of positive opinion, 481.
Prayer Book, time of Edward VI. doctrine of real presence, then undecided, 206—that afterwards published distinctly denies the doctrine, ib.
Prayer Book of Establishment driven to find its most fervent expressions in Catholic books, 481.
Priest to be considered in the light of judge, and to be skilled in extenuating circumstances, 486.
Protestants, English, their condition corresponds more with that of heathen than heretic of early times, 481—their tendency rather to assumption of false premises than to drawing wrong conclusions, 483—their condition likened to that of the Jews at Our Lord's coming, 485—their hasty conclusions on visiting Catholic Churches, 488.
Prester, John, 456.
Privy Council Judgment of, briefly states the principles embodied in the answers to these several motions, 197—rejects all idea of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist.
Rambler, the, controversy with, 245.

- Rationalism**, French, 431.
Recreation, difference between that word and that of amusement—real meaning of, 275—what it should consist in, 275—varies with national character, 277.
Refugio, the, at Turin, 128.
Religion, Catholic, the best regulator of a people's amusement, 289—of China, 441.
Remusat, Abel, great Chinese scholar, 439.
Report of Irish Church Missions, 365—desponding statements, 371—bears testimony to the zeal of the clergy, 373—list of converts, 377—and losses, ib.
Resolution, the, a conspiracy, 31—character of the conspirators, ib.—not connected with King James' conduct, but long before prepared, 42—arose in the fear of the Catholic Church, entertained by the plundering nobles, 62.
Rome, Religion of, in Pagan times, strong by influencing the manners of the people, 499.
Rossi, Matthew, 463—his mass for the Chinese, 466—his use of mathematics, 467—progress of his missions, 469—his opinions of the Chinese doctrine, 478.
Right, Tenant, attempt to unite members and electors on has failed, 224—should not be the base of union to which all members returned by Catholic constituents should be pledged, 224.
Right, Philosophy of, 436.
Russell, Lord, his real character, 39—Justice of his conviction, 41, 43—his prosecution of Lord Stafford, ib.—opposes the remission of the cruelties of his sentence, ib.
 —, Lord John, opposes the Charitable Trusts Act, is not supported by Catholics, 217.
Santa Sabina, discoveries made in garden of, 162—monastery of bestowed by Pope Honorius on St. Dominic, 161—celebrated for Beato Angelico, and other artists belonging to it, 161.
Schmidt, Martin, work on Wandering Jew, 185.
Scriptures, the Holy, their corroboration of the Catholic Church, 354—should not be too freely given to the eastern heathen, 395.
Servius Tullius, wall of, discovered in course of excavations, 163—another portion found by Jesuits on opposite side of Aventine Hill, 163.
Shaftesbury, anecdote of, 30—outbids the Earl of Danby in the no-papery cry, 38.
Siam, kingdom of, 384—an extract from its history, 385.
Siamese, the, their manners and character, 390—their veneration of authority, 392.
Sisterhoods, Protestant, 134, 187.
Slavery of the Spanish Indians, not encouraged by the court of Spain, 297—opposed by the Dominicans, 300—opposed in the council of the Indies by the king's preachers, 304—in Siam, 391.
Sowerby, 363—difficult to ascertain the degree of its progress, 364, 374—promoted by the distribution of handbills, 366—dangerous to children, 379—to the Irish in London, 381.
Spain, causes of its decline, 294—retributive justice for the enslavement of the Indians, 312.
Spaenger, Mr., laugh turned against, in House of Commons, 483.
Spurgeon, Mr., what is the secret of his attractiveness, 280.
Sunday, how kept in England, 272.
Sydney, his character, 39.
Sympathy, our, tends rather to the indifferentist than the bigot, 484.
School Fatalist, 494—involves no moral teaching, ib.
 — Naturalist considers history simply as the Journal of human progress, 495—many belong to it who recognise the supernatural destiny of man, ib.—tends to consider Christianity an affair of race, ib.
 — Providential regards history as the exponent of God's dealings with man, 496—contains many varieties of views, ib.
Table, Communion, declared to be quite distinct from altar, 207—wooden cross to be removed from that at St. Pauls, 201.
 —, Credence, order for removal of, reversed, 208.
Tehingiz Khan, 457—expeditions to convert him ib.
Tertullian, passage from, 171—allusion to Christians as worshippers of the cross, 180—argument drawn thence of the honour paid by early Christians to the crucifix, ib.
Test Bill, the passing of the, 33.
Trusts, Charitable Act, might involve a serious infringement of Catholic rights, 217—the object of it to bring all charities under control of Protestant Board, 217—its execution twice delayed, 218.
Truth, indolence shown in investigation of, 483.
Tertullian, 504.
Union, the, newspaper, 95—its Catholic teaching, 96—how far in advance of Tract, 90, 96—points out the defects of Tractarianism, 97—espouses the cause of Archdeacon Denison, 102—its supporters placed in a false position, 109—has shown symptoms of yielding to a generalization of principles, 110—significance of the appearance of such a paper, 121.
 — of Churches, how far practicable, 118.
Vasco de Gama, 462.
Vermeil le Pasteur, 126.
Ward, Mr., his opinions upon the characters of English history, 40.
Wilde, Dr., his statistical report.
William, King, implicated in the massacre of the Brothers de Witt, 49—and in plots against King James, ib.—his conduct examined, 49—authorizes the massacre of Glencoe, 67—torture and other cruelties, ib.—his unjust trials, 69—Smollett's character of his reign, 73.
Wilberforce, Mr. Robert, his book on the Real Presence, 487.
Wiseman, Cardinal, article on scribbling on the walls of the Palace of Cæsars, 160—prediction verified, 166.
Workhouses, their condition, 126.
Zosimus, his views of the Church in the fourth century, 493.

